

# bulletin





# *The Department of State bulletin*

VOL. XXVIII, No. 719 • PUBLICATION 4999

April 6, 1953

J X  
232  
A 435

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:

52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25  
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has  
been approved by the Director of the  
Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not  
copyrighted and items contained herein may  
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT  
OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be  
appreciated.

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.*

General  
Dipas.

## U.S. and France Discuss Measures To Promote Peace

### TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE OF MARCH 28

Press release 160 dated March 28

1. Representatives of the United States and France, meeting in Washington, today concluded a detailed review of a wide range of problems which face both governments in Europe, the Far East and the Near East. Peace will always remain the basic policy of the United States and France. The discussions, therefore, centered on measures for obtaining peace where there is fighting and for consolidating peace where threats exist.

2. It was agreed, in the absence of any tangible proof to the contrary, that recent developments in the Soviet Union had not changed the basic nature of the threat confronting the free world. The representatives of both countries were in full agreement on the necessity of concerting their efforts so as to defeat Communist aggression in the Far East and to strengthen the defenses of the free countries in the West. They remain convinced that true peace can be achieved and maintained only by constructive efforts of all free nations.

3. It was recognized that Communist aggressive moves in the Far East obviously are parts of the same pattern. Therefore, while the full burden of the fighting in Indochina falls on the forces of the French Union including those of the Associated States, and similarly the United States bears the heaviest burden in Korea, the prosecution of these operations cannot be successfully carried out without full recognition of their interdependence. This in turn requires the continuation of frequent diplomatic and military consultation between the two Governments.

The French Government reasserted its resolve to do its utmost to increase the effectiveness of the French and Associated States forces in Indochina, with a view to destroying the organized Communist forces and to bringing peace and prosperity to her free associates within the French Union, Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam. The Ambassadors of Viet-Nam and Cambodia were present and participated in this phase of the discussions.

Advantage was taken of this meeting to con-

tinue discussion of plans prepared by the High Command in Indochina for military action there. These plans are being developed with a view to achieving success in Indochina and are being given intensive study so as to determine how and to what extent the United States may be able to contribute materiel and financial support to their achievement.

Obviously any armistice which might be concluded in Korea by the United Nations would be entered into in the hope that it would be a step toward peace. It was the view of both Governments, however, that should the Chinese Communist regime take advantage of such an armistice to pursue aggressive war elsewhere in the Far East, such action would have the most serious consequences for the efforts to bring about peace in the world and would conflict directly with the understanding on which any armistice in Korea would rest.

4. The two Governments reaffirmed their common interest in controlling together with other nations of the free world the movement of strategic materials to nations whose policies jeopardize the peace and security of the free world. Both Governments undertook to continue action toward that end.

In order to render more effective the application of the United Nations General Assembly resolution of May 18, 1951,<sup>1</sup> the French Government intends to take the measures necessary to prevent

- a) the bunkering of ships carrying to Communist China cargoes of strategic materials, and
- b) the transportation by French ships of cargoes of strategic character to ports of Communist China.

The two Governments in cooperation with other interested Governments will keep under constant review the list of items embargoed to Communist China in order to include goods whose strategic character will have been demonstrated.

5. In their discussions on the European area, the two Governments recognized the continuing urgent need to permit a German military contri-

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of May 28, 1951, p. 849.

bution to the defense of Europe and through the Contractual Agreements replace the present occupation regime of Germany. Both Governments agreed on the necessity of the establishment, with minimum delay, of the European Defense Community, which will promote sincere cooperation between France and Germany and thus serve the interests of the Atlantic Community as well as advance the security and unity of Europe.

The two delegations noted with satisfaction the agreement by the Interim Committee of the European Defense Community on the protocols interpretative to the Treaty. For their part the representatives of France foresaw their acceptance by their Government.

It was recognized that this important step toward ratification of the Treaty would enable rapid progress in the Interim Committee on the technical steps preparatory to the Treaty coming into force and thereby ensure that its benefits would be secured as soon as possible after ratification.

The importance of a settlement of the question of the Saar was recognized and it was agreed that this should be sought at the earliest opportunity on a basis which would provide a European status for the Saar conforming to the principles of the European Defense and the Coal and Steel Communities. The French delegation explained in detail the reasons which, in its view, justify and render necessary a Franco-German agreement on such a settlement prior to ratification of the European Defense Community Treaty.

6. The French delegation explained the economic and budgetary implications for France of carrying out her defense programs in Europe as well as in the Far East.

7. The two delegations recognized that the European Defense Community is to be constituted within a constantly developing Atlantic Community.

Therefore they place great importance upon efforts to improve the effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This general question as well as that of the essential balance between military necessities and economic possibilities will again be considered during the next meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Paris on April 23.

8. The participation by France in the European Community alters in no way her interests and responsibilities outside of Europe. In the light of the world position of both nations, which is reflected in particular in the charter of the United Nations, the United States Government and the Government of France will consult with one another on general problems as occasion demands in the future as in the past.

9. An exchange of views was also held on economic and financial questions.

The discussions included a survey of the budgetary position and outlook as well as a review

of economic developments in the United States and in France.

The French representatives outlined their views on the recent talks at the Organization for European Economic Cooperation in Paris concerning progress toward better balanced and expanding world trade, and the objective of convertibility of currencies and multilateral trade and payments. It was agreed that steps to advance this progress would require further study by the United States, the member countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and other governments.

## ARRIVAL OF FRENCH MINISTERS

Press release 155 dated March 25

*Following are the texts of statements of welcome made by Vice President Nixon and Secretary Dulles to the French Ministers on their arrival at the Washington National Airport on March 25, together with the reply of Prime Minister René Mayer:*

### Vice President Nixon

I am honored on behalf of the President and the Government of the United States to welcome the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Minister for the Associated States of Indochina, and the Finance Minister of our great sister Republic of France.

It is quite significant that this is the first official visit of the Head of Government of a foreign state since the inauguration of President Eisenhower. It is, I think, particularly fitting that this is the case because we all recall that the Government of France was the first to enter into diplomatic relationships with our Government during our war of independence. It was 175 years ago during a very bitter cold winter at Valley Forge that the treaty of alliance and friendship between our two countries was entered into, and since that time, over a century and a half, our two peoples and our two Governments have stood together in meeting great crises.

Today we are confronted with great problems in the world but we are convinced that the discussions and meetings which will take place at the very highest level between the representatives of our two Governments will not only assist in solving the mutual problems which confront us but also will serve the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world. Thank you.

### Secretary Dulles

We welcome the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Mayer, and the Ministers who accompany him. We meet as personal friends as well as official friends. I have long known Mr. Mayer and Mr.

Bidault, now the Minister of Foreign Affairs. We resume here conversations which Mr. Stassen and I began in Paris last month.

We meet here as representatives of two great and friendly powers. We in the United States respect and admire France, whose leaders vigorously seized the opportunity to advance postwar Europe toward unity and strength. Among those leaders stands Prime Minister Mayer, a man of vision and determination who boldly and courageously fights for victories of peace in Europe and victories of war against communism in Asia. That is the spirit which symbolizes the France we love and are proud to acclaim as our ally.

#### **The Prime Minister**

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Secretary: I am deeply moved by your very kind words, so deeply moved that before I venture to go to my prepared statement I will try from the bottom of my heart to convey to you the appreciation and friendship of the people of France to the sister of liberty who in our history have always been on the same side.

We have fought in two wars and come out on top, and in Asia we are fighting side by side and with our common determination and our cooperation we shall both see through to victory and to peace.

And now may I turn to my statement: In the course of the past few years, Mr. Bidault, my colleagues and myself have several times enjoyed the hospitality of this beautiful capital and we already find a great pleasure in this same friendly atmosphere. As I told you in Paris a few months ago, it will be a special privilege for us to meet President Eisenhower again. To the French, his name has been, since the war, a symbol of victory and freedom and it has more recently become also the symbol of unity in the Atlantic community.

We will devote much time, during our visit here, to discuss the political, economic, and military problems this community is presently faced with.

In this respect, we will stress our efforts to build up a united Europe and to create the European Defense Community (Eoc). The Government I preside has submitted the Eoc treaty to the French Parliament and has committed itself to request its ratification. I have clearly stated the prerequisite conditions of this ratification.

We will likewise discuss our common problems outside Europe. In Asia, our two countries have unfortunately a large number of soldiers engaged in bitter fighting against the same enemy. How we can best defeat aggression will be an essential part of our talks. We are confident we will, like you in Korea, reach victory in Indochina with the participation of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. In many other areas of the world, we also have common responsibilities or identical

duties, among which the advancement of democracy and the progress of economic welfare in underdeveloped areas occupy a prominent place.

I feel sure that our mutual understanding and our unity of action will greatly benefit from these consultations.

#### **U.S. Represented on Commission for Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Elections**

The Department of State announced on March 23 (press release 154) that, in reply to requests received from the Governments of Egypt and the United Kingdom, the Government of the United States has agreed to participate on the Mixed Electoral Commission for the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Warwick Perkins, a Foreign Service career officer of class one, has been nominated as U.S. representative on the Commission. Mr. Perkins departed for Khartoum on March 19, 1953, and has been accorded by the President the personal rank of Minister for the duration of his service on this Commission.

The Anglo-Egyptian Agreement of February 12, 1953, on the Sudan provided for the election of a Sudanese Parliament as a step toward self-government and self-determination in that country. The election is to be supervised by a Mixed Electoral Commission consisting of representatives of the Sudan, Egypt, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Harold W. Glidden, who is at present a member of the Department's Division of Research for the Near East, will assist Mr. Perkins. Also a Foreign Service officer, he formerly was attached to the Embassy at Cairo.

#### **President Expresses Sympathy on Death of Queen Mary**

White House press release dated March 24

*The President on March 24 sent the following cable to Winthrop Aldrich, U.S. Ambassador to the Court of St. James, for delivery to Queen Elizabeth II:*

Please extend to Her Majesty and to all the members and peoples of the British Commonwealth my deep personal sympathy on the passing of Queen Mary. The hearts of all Americans go out to Her Majesty tonight as our prayers are extended to her, Princess Margaret and the members of the Royal Family for the great personal loss they have sustained. Queen Mary was a good and great Queen. Free peoples the world over will mourn her loss.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

## Exchange of Sick and Wounded Prisoners of War

*On February 22 Gen. Mark Clark, U.N. Commander in Korea, asked the North Korean and Chinese Communist leaders to agree to an immediate exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war. The proposal was one that had been made several times since the beginning of truce negotiations in July 1951. On March 28 the Peiping radio broadcast the text of a reply in which the Communist leaders expressed willingness to proceed with the repatriation of sick and wounded prisoners and proposed resumption of the truce negotiations which were suspended on October 8, 1952. Following are texts of the correspondence and of statements by Secretary Dulles and Lincoln White, Deputy Special Assistant for Press Relations.*

### GENERAL CLARK'S LETTER

To Kim Il Sung, Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army, and Peng Teh-Huai, Commander of the Chinese People's Volunteers:

The Executive Committee of the League of Red Cross Societies, in a resolution adopted in Geneva, Switzerland, on 13 December 1952 called on both sides in the Korean conflict as a gesture of good will to take immediate action in implementing the humanitarian provisions of the Geneva Convention by repatriating sick and wounded prisoners of war in accordance with appropriate articles of the Geneva Convention.

As has been repeatedly stated to you in the course of negotiations at Panmunjom the United Nations Command has from the very beginning adhered scrupulously to the humanitarian provisions of the Geneva Convention and in particular has been prepared to carry out the provisions of the Geneva Convention in regard to the sick and wounded prisoners in its custody. The United Nations Command remains ready immediately to repatriate those seriously sick and seriously wounded captured personnel who are fit to travel in accordance with provisions of Article 109 of the Geneva Convention.

I wish to be informed whether you are prepared for your part to proceed immediately with the re-

patriation of seriously sick and wounded captured personnel of the United Nations Command who are in your hands. The United Nations Command liaison officers will be prepared to meet your liaison officers to make necessary arrangements for impartial verification of the conditions and for the mutual exchange of such seriously sick and wounded in accordance with the provisions of Article 109 of the Geneva Convention.

### COMMUNISTS' REPLY

General Mark Clark, Commander in Chief, United Nations Command:

We received your letter, dated February 22d, concerning the question of repatriation, with priority, of seriously sick and seriously injured prisoners of war of both sides. The delegates for armistice negotiations of both sides had, as a matter of fact, reached agreement in accordance with humanitarian principles on paragraph 53 of the draft Korean armistice agreement.

It was solely because the Korean armistice negotiations were suspended that there was no way to implement this agreed provision. In consequence, it has not been possible, up to the present, to repatriate seriously sick and seriously injured prisoners of war of both sides.

Since your side now expresses readiness to apply the provisions of the Geneva Convention to sick and injured prisoners of war in the custody of both sides, our side, as an expression of similar intent, fully agrees to your side's proposal to exchange sick and injured prisoners of war of both sides during the period of hostilities.

This proposal could be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of Article 109 of the Geneva Convention.

At the same time we consider that the reasonable settlement of the question of exchanging sick and injured prisoners of war of both sides during the period of hostilities should be made to lead to the smooth settlement of the entire question of prisoners of war, thereby achieving an armistice in Korea, for which peoples throughout the world are longing.

Therefore, our side proposes that the delegates for armistice negotiations of both sides immediately resume the negotiations at Panmunjom. Furthermore, our liaison officer is prepared to meet your liaison officer to discuss and decide on the date for resuming the negotiations.

*Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army.*

**KIM IL SUNG**

*Commander of the Chinese People's Volunteers*

**PENG TEH-HUAI**

### **STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES**

Press release 159 dated March 28

For some time in the past, the U.N. Command in Korea has been seeking an exchange of wounded and sick prisoners of war as a humanitarian move. These efforts have been without result until on February 22, 1953, that effort was resumed. It now appears that our offer made on that date has been accepted.

The U.S. Government hopes that this exchange of prisoners will occur promptly and provide relief to those who suffer and to their anxious relatives and friends.

**EDITOR'S NOTE.** Following are the texts of the relevant articles of the Geneva Convention:

#### **ARTICLE 109**

Subject to the provisions of the third paragraph of this Article, Parties to the conflict are bound to send back to their own country, regardless of number or rank, seriously wounded and seriously sick prisoners of war, after having cared for them until they are fit to travel, in accordance with the first paragraph of the following Article.

Throughout the duration of hostilities, Parties to the conflict shall endeavour, with the cooperation of the neutral Powers concerned, to make agreements for the accommodation in neutral countries of the sick and wounded prisoners of war referred to in the second paragraph of the following Article. They may, in addition, conclude agreements with a view to the direct repatriation or internment in a neutral country of able-bodied prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity.

No sick or injured prisoner of war who is eligible for repatriation under the first paragraph of this Article, may be repatriated against his will during hostilities.

#### **ARTICLE 110**

The following shall be repatriated direct:

(1) Incurably wounded and sick whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely diminished.

(2) Wounded and sick who, according to medical opinion, are not likely to recover within one year, whose condition requires treatment and whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely diminished.

(3) Wounded and sick who have recovered, but whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely and permanently diminished.

### **STATEMENT BY PRESS OFFICER WHITE<sup>2</sup>**

[Excerpts]

The Communist message is an unconditional acceptance of the proposal made by General Clark on February 22 for the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war who are fit to travel in accordance with article 109 of the Geneva Convention.

That article provides just that: that prisoners of war—that is, sick and wounded prisoners of war who are fit to travel—be permitted to go home on a voluntary—I emphasize voluntary—basis.

Clark's letter made the specific proposal that arrangements be made to carry this out through the liaison officers. Therefore, this does not require a resumption of armistice negotiations by the delegations. The acceptance of this Pow proposal is an entirely separate question. . . .

Now, as I say, the precise figures will have to be worked out between the liaison people, and on the exchange itself Clark has full authority to go ahead. He has had it since this offer was made. . . .

<sup>2</sup> Made at a press and radio conference on Mar. 28.

The following may be accommodated in a neutral country:

(1) Wounded and sick whose recovery may be expected within one year of the date of the wound or the beginning of the illness, if treatment in a neutral country might increase the prospects of a more certain and speedy recovery.

(2) Prisoners of war whose mental or physical health, according to medical opinion, is seriously threatened by continued captivity, but whose accommodation in a neutral country might remove such a threat.

The conditions which prisoners of war accommodated in a neutral country must fulfill in order to permit their repatriation shall be fixed, as shall likewise their status, by agreement between the Powers concerned. In general, prisoners of war who have been accommodated in a neutral country, and who belong to the following categories, should be repatriated:

(1) Those whose state of health has deteriorated so as to fulfill the conditions laid down for direct repatriation;

(2) Those whose mental or physical powers remain, even after treatment, considerably impaired.

If no special agreements are concluded between the Parties to the conflict concerned, to determine the cases of disablement or sickness entailing direct repatriation or accommodation in a neutral country, such cases shall be settled in accordance with the principles laid down in the Model Agreement concerning direct repatriation and accommodation in neutral countries of wounded and sick prisoners of war and in the Regulations concerning Mixed Medical Commissions annexed to the present Convention.

## Formal Diplomatic Claims Preferred Against Hungary and U. S. S. R. for Their Conduct in 1951 Plane Case

### SUMMARY OF U. S. NOTES OF MARCH 17

#### Press release 140 dated March 17

The U.S. Government on March 17 preferred formal diplomatic claims against the Soviet and Hungarian Governments on account of their conduct in the case of the USAF C-47 airplane 6026 and its crew who came down in Hungary on November 19, 1951. These claims were contained in notes delivered on March 17 to the Soviet Government by Jacob D. Beam, Chargé d'Affaires *ad interim* of the United States at Moscow, and to the Hungarian Government by George M. Abbott, Chargé d'Affaires *ad interim* of the United States at Budapest.<sup>1</sup>

The note directed to the Soviet Government incorporates, by reference, the allegations in the note directed to the Hungarian Government, and vice versa. The notes assert a joint and several liability on the part of both Governments for all the damage caused by them to the United States and to the four American airmen who constituted the crew of the airplane: Capt. Dave H. Henderson, Capt. John J. Swift, Sgt. Jess A. Duff, and Sgt. James A. Elam.

The notes demand payment of \$637,894.15 in damages, broken down into \$98,779.29 with interest at 6 percent from November 19, 1951, for the value of the airplane, its equipment, and cargo; \$123,605.15 with interest at 6 percent from December 28, 1951, on account of the fine paid by the U.S. Government to the Hungarian Government under protest to obtain the release of the four airmen; \$200,000, the amount of the damages to the four airmen in consequence of their unlawful detention and mistreatment, and manifest denials of justice concerted against them by both accused Governments; and \$215,509.67 on account of the damages to the United States by both accused Governments acting in concert. The notes state:

<sup>1</sup> Texts of the notes, in pamphlet form, may be obtained by writing to the Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

The United States Government declares that the figure of \$215,509.67 . . . does not include any sum on account of the item of intangible injury deliberately and intentionally caused the United States Government and the American people by the wrongful actions of the Soviet and Hungarian Governments. Such injury is not easily calculable in money and money could not compensate for it. The United States Government has determined, therefore, for the present to defer the formulation of the kind and measure of redress or other action the Soviet Government and the Hungarian Government should take which would be appropriate in international law and practice to confirm the illegality of the actions directed by them against the United States Government and the American people.

The liability of the two Governments being joint and several, any payments by either Government would be considered as a credit to the account of the other, but both remain liable to the United States for the entire sum.

If the Soviet and Hungarian Governments, in their reply, acknowledge indebtedness and agree to pay damages due the United States, the U.S. Government is prepared to present detailed evidence in support of its calculations of damages suffered and alleged. The notes conclude that in the event that the accused Governments contest liability they should so state, and they are notified that the U.S. Government proposes in that event that the disputes be presented for hearing and decision in the International Court of Justice. Since the Soviet and Hungarian Governments have not accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, they are requested to take the necessary steps to empower the Court to determine the issues of fact and law set forth in the notes.

Notes heretofore delivered by the U.S. Government to the two accused Governments<sup>2</sup> were intended as preliminary to the preference by the United States of formal diplomatic claims. The

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of Dec. 22, 1952, pp. 981-984; *ibid.*, Jan. 12, 1953, pp. 51-52; and *ibid.*, Feb. 16, 1953, pp. 258-259.

preliminary notes gave both Governments adequate opportunity to return the plane and its equipment and cargo which they had unlawfully seized, to disclose evidence in their possession bearing on the incident, and to provide justification, if any existed, for the actions which they took. Both Governments failed or declined to make responsive or satisfactory replies or to provide any of the material requested. Thereupon the liability of both Governments for acts of concerted and deliberate international wrong to the four airmen and to the United States became legally absolute.

The notes delivered on March 17 set out in considerable detail, for the first time, the essential facts which an intensive investigation by the U.S. Government since the incident occurred has disclosed, and which the U.S. Government "is prepared to prove in an appropriate forum by evidence." The violations both of international law and existing treaty obligations, of which the Soviet and Hungarian Governments are guilty, are also set out.

The notes show the flight of C-47 6026 from Erding, Germany, on November 19, 1951, was solely for the purpose of delivering air freight to the American air attaché at Belgrade; that the airplane was blown off course by winds whose direction and velocity were unknown to the crew; that the plane unknown to the crew flew north of course to Rumania; that, therefore, being unable to descend at Belgrade the crew turned westward to return to their base; and that unwittingly they crossed the Hungarian border.

The notes assert further that the crew, finding they were lost, in darkness, and running low in fuel, made every effort to obtain assistance from persons on the ground; that the Soviet and Hungarian authorities knowing these facts deliberately withheld assistance and then, by arrangement, when the airplane was a few minutes from the safety of the British Zone of Austria, a Soviet fighter craft brought the plane down at what turned out to be a Soviet-controlled field near Papa, Hungary. It is asserted that the crew at no time knew that they were overflying any country but Yugoslavia and thought they had landed in Yugoslavia when they came down at 6:00 p. m. on the evening of November 19, 1951.

The note to the Soviet Government then details the various illegal actions taken by the Soviet authorities against the men, such as their seizure and detention, refusal to notify the U.S. Government that the plane had come down safely on Hungarian soil and was in Soviet custody, causing the United States to spend large sums in fruitless search; although the men truthfully answered all questions put to them, the Soviet authorities deceived them into believing that they would be freed but refused them access to American officials in Hungary and then turned them over to Hungarian

authorities. Both notes point out that the Soviet Government had no authority whatever to turn the men or the plane over to Hungarian authorities, and assert that the Soviet Government remains liable for the seizure and conversion of the airplane and its contents.

The legal authority of the Soviet Government to exercise sovereignty in Hungary is flatly denied.

Asserting that the Soviet Government and the Hungarian Government aided and abetted each other in the events that took place from November 19 on, the note to the Soviet Government specifies various false statements made by the Soviet Government on this subject, particularly those by the Soviet Foreign Office and by the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vyshinsky in the course of debates in the U.N. General Assembly at Paris in December 1951 and January 1952. Point by point, the United States demonstrates the falsity of the statements made by Vyshinsky and states that these statements were known to the Soviet Government to be false when they were made.

The note to the Hungarian Government sets forth in detail the actions which the Hungarian Government took against the men after they were turned over to Hungarian custody. It details the acts of deception and fraud against the four airmen, and recounts in detail the star-chamber proceedings against the men on trumped-up charges by a military court in Budapest.

The recitals show that the men were placed on trial without warning, without a chance to choose counsel or to prepare a defense or to understand the charges. The trial is shown to have been replete not only with violations of international law but with violations of clear provisions of Hungarian domestic law and procedure. The note characterizes as false, and as known by the Hungarian Government to be false, various statements which the Hungarian Government has made with respect to the trial, including those made in the Hungarian Government's most recent notes to the United States on this subject, the latest being February 9, 1953.

The note to the Hungarian Government further points out that the judgment of the military court fining the airmen 360,000 forints (over \$30,000) each was without any justification even by any provision of Hungarian law. As further evidence of the true motives of the two Governments, the note discloses the violation by the Hungarian Government of three existing written agreements between the United States and Hungary by which the U.S. Government had the right to call on the Hungarian Government to provide local currency to the United States for expenditures in Hungary out of a large dollar balance then due to the U.S. Government from the Hungarian Government. The Hungarian Government arbitrarily demanded that the United States pay U.S. dollars from sources outside of Hungary on account of the fine, although the fine was levied in local cur-

rency. The note charges that nevertheless the United States paid the dollars demanded, under protest, and points out that if the United States had not paid, the two accused Governments planned to turn the men over for trials in Rumania and perhaps other Soviet-controlled areas.

The motives of the accused Governments are related to a Soviet propaganda campaign in the General Assembly of the United Nations meeting in Paris, and to a purpose of extorting dollars from the United States and of converting to their own use the American airplane and its contents. The notes say:

The actions of the Soviet and Hungarian Governments with reference to this matter coincided in time with the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris. The Soviet Government, in prearranged concert with its allies (including the Hungarian Government), in and out of the United Nations, were engaged in a campaign of propaganda and vilification against the United States, seeking to make it appear that the United States Government had embarked on a program of subversion of the Soviet and allied governments under the authority of the Mutual Security Act enacted by the United States Congress. The United States Government believes, and asserts, that this campaign was intended by the Soviet Government to divert the minds of the international public and the member governments of the United Nations, then meeting in Paris, from the systematic operations of international subversion of established governments and social institutions throughout the world, and other misconduct, carried on by the Soviet Government and its allies, overtly and secretly.

Largely unsuccessful in this campaign, the Soviet and Hungarian Governments in concert seized upon the fortuitous and wholly innocent presence, within their physical power, of four American airmen whom they had caused to come down in Hungary and be detained there, in order to provide so-called evidence to prove the Soviet and Soviet-allied propaganda charges against the United States. Knowing at all times that the charges against the airmen, as against the United States, were false and unfounded and that a free and open hearing or investigation according to the practice of civilized and honorable governments would demonstrate the falsity of these charges the Soviet and Hungarian Governments in concert deliberately denied the airmen access to American consular or diplomatic authorities, denied the airmen representation by independent legal counsel, subjected the airmen to a trial by a military court whose judgment was predetermined, held the trial *in camera* where no member of the public was present, kept the airmen continuously incomunicado, denied them and the United States Government access to judicial records and dossiers in the case, and in other ways attempted to conceal from the airmen, the United States Government, and the international public the manifest injustices deliberately perpetrated by the Soviet and Hungarian Governments upon these American nationals as upon the United States Government.

The statements issued by the Soviet and Hungarian authorities in concert with respect to this matter were deliberately and wilfully broadcast to the world by these governments, or were uttered so as to be so broadcast in the usual dissemination of news of international interest, with the purpose and intention of causing damage to the United States and to the airmen themselves. . . .

The United States Government is compelled to conclude, and it charges, that the foregoing actions, whether committed separately by the Soviet Government or in conjunction or in concert with the Hungarian Government, were deliberately and unlawfully committed with ulterior intent to serve a propaganda purpose of the Soviet Gov-

ernment, to cause unlawful damage to the four American airmen above named, and to the United States Government, to convert unlawfully to the use and profit of the Soviet Government and the Hungarian Government the United States Air Force plane 6026, its equipment and its cargo, and to obtain unlawfully from the United States the sum of \$123,605.15.

## Mr. Douglas Heads Trade Survey

At his press conference on March 19 the President announced that Lewis W. Douglas, former Ambassador to the United Kingdom and former Director of the Budget, had been named head of a committee to study U.S. trade relations. The group will make a broad survey which will cover money problems, commodities, raw materials, markets, and surpluses.

## Expansion of Point Four Program in Egypt

Press release 145 dated March 19

A large-scale program in which the United States will assist the Government of Egypt in reclaiming wastelands and resettling landless farmers was announced on March 19 by the Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

An agreement covering the cooperative program, which involves a considerable expansion of Point Four activities in Egypt, was signed at Cairo on that date by representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of Egypt.

The United States will contribute \$10,000,000 to a joint fund, to which the Government of Egypt will contribute a sum amounting to approximately the equivalent of \$15,700,000 in Egyptian pounds. An Egyptian-American Rural Improvement Service is being established to administer the fund, which will be jointly controlled by the president of the Egyptian National Resources Development Board and John R. Nichols, director of the Point Four Program in Egypt.

Present plans call for carrying out the development work in two project areas, one in the Delta province of Baheira and the other in the province of Fayoum, south of Cairo. Some 20,000 acres in the Baheira area and 60,000 acres in the Fayoum will be reclaimed by drainage and other measures and a total of about 16,000 families of landless peasants will be resettled, according to preliminary estimates.

The present Government of Egypt has undertaken a vigorous program of reform and national development, aimed primarily at improving the lot of Egypt's 20 million people, most of whom are dependent upon agriculture for a living. The typical peasant is extremely poor and agricultural land is scarce. Less than 4 percent of Egypt's

area is habitable, and the population density averages about 1,600 persons to the square mile of cultivated area.

Secretary Dulles recently expressed the interest of the United States and its sympathy for the progressive attitude and energetic efforts of the Government of General Naguib to meet and overcome the internal problems that face the Egyptian people, and wished the Government every success in its efforts.<sup>1</sup>

The land-development and resettlement program represents a major expansion of American assistance to Egypt in its economic development. Cooperative Point Four activities in Egypt at the present time involve expenditures of about \$3,000,000 by the Technical Cooperation Administration in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

These activities, carried out under the general Point Four agreement between the United States and Egypt, signed May 5, 1951,<sup>2</sup> consist of technical advice and demonstration supplies and equipment in various fields including agriculture, health, education, rural improvement, industrial development, natural resources, and public administration. A demonstration of range improvement is under way in the western desert which it is hoped will result in the eventual development of 2 or 3 million acres for livestock production. A team of American industrial specialists is helping the Egyptian Government locate and promote opportunities for industrial expansion with the aid of private capital. Improved building materials from inexpensive local sources are being perfected. American technicians are assisting their Egyptian colleagues in rural-improvement activities through village centers, helping improve health and sanitation conditions, aiding in improving educational facilities and methods, and helping train Egyptian technicians in many kinds of specialized work.

The resettlement projects to be undertaken as a result of the new agreement will be developed around villages, the accepted pattern of rural life in Egypt. These villages will be planned and built with fullest use of local labor and materials. Improved housing, community facilities, vocational schools, public-health services, sanitation works, small-scale marketing and processing facilities for farm crops, and farm-to-market roads must be provided in the project areas. They will employ the services of the villagers to the greatest possible extent. The project also includes assistance in the organization and operation of cooperatives, demonstrations of improved water conservation and management practices, training of agricultural extension and other rural-service workers, and advice to the farmers in farm management and improved methods.

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 23, 1953, p. 306.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, May 21, 1951, p. 823.

## MSA Defense Support Funds for Turkey

The Mutual Security Agency announced on March 17 that Turkey will receive \$54 million in MSA defense support funds during the present fiscal year.

These funds, MSA said, will permit Turkey to purchase essential capital equipment and other commodities which are important to Turkey's expanding defense effort. Turkey also is receiving substantial amounts of American assistance through participation in MSA's productivity and technical assistance program and the military end-item program of the Department of Defense. MSA may make available a further \$1 million for Turkey if agreement is reached on the use of special funds for the promotion of free enterprise.

To date MSA has made allotments totaling \$45 million to Turkey for the current fiscal year.

Reporting on the Turkish defense effort, MSA said that Turkey is devoting approximately 40 percent of its national budget, including counterpart funds, for defense and that its military force, in relation to population, is one of the highest of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members. Next to South Korea, the United States, and the British Commonwealth, Turkey is making the largest contribution to the U.N. forces in Korea.

Defense support funds are designed to permit the European NATO members to make greater contributions to the common defense effort than would be possible with their own resources. Turkey's position as a growing producer of such highly important strategic materials as copper, magnesium, and chrome, as well as other commodities such as wheat and coal is an important factor, MSA points out, in developing a stronger Turkish economy and in meeting the raw materials deficiencies of Western Europe and the United States.

In addition to support in these fields, MSA through its technical assistance program is helping Turkey to develop such vital activities as its telecommunications network, its transportation system, and its airfields. All of these are important, MSA said, to the defense of Western Europe's southern flank.

The growth of Turkish economy in terms of gross national product has been rapid, expanding more than a third since the start of the Marshall Plan in 1948. Chromite production has increased 75 percent; copper, 118 percent; cereals, 37 percent; cotton, 175 percent, and sugar beets, 85 percent over this period. New power facilities have been constructed and the number of tractors on farms has grown from 3,000 to approximately 35,000.

Aid extended to Turkey during the Marshall Plan by the Economic Cooperation Administration, MSA's predecessor agency, was designed to

strengthen the economic base upon which Turkey is building its defense program. This aid, through June 30, 1952, amounted to \$222.5 million, of which \$84 million was in loans. This does not include drawing rights under the intra-European payments agreements and credits accorded Turkey under the European Payments Union (EPU).

Counterpart funds generated as a result of ECA-Msa dollar grants to Turkey (Turkey deposits an equivalent amount of Turkish lira in the counterpart fund to match Msa grants) is also being used to support the Turkish defense program. Approximately \$87 million in Turkish lira, more than half the total available counterpart, has been used to develop armament production, provide additional troop training, and build air bases.

## **Canadian Prime Minister to Visit Washington**

White House press release dated March 13

The White House announced on March 13 that the Prime Minister of Canada, Louis S. St. Laurent, will be in Washington as the guest of the President on May 7 and May 8. The President's invitation to the Prime Minister was conveyed to Mr. St. Laurent by Don C. Bliss, Chargé d'Afaires of the United States Embassy in Ottawa.

In addition to seeing the President, the Prime Minister will meet with Secretary Dulles and other Government officials. No agenda for the conversations has as yet been determined but it is expected that matters of general interest to the United States and Canada will be considered at that time.

## **Guaranty Issued for Private Investment in France**

International Water Corporation of Pittsburgh has obtained a U.S. Government guaranty of currency convertibility to protect an investment in France of water-well-drilling equipment and the licensing of techniques and processes, the Mutual Security Administration announced on March 17.

This business venture by International Water Corporation is intended to promote the development of large-scale water supplies for municipali-

ties and industries in France, thus contributing to essential needs of the country. The equipment and methods also may be used in other countries of Western Europe.

The U.S. guaranty, issued by the Mutual Security Agency under its Investment Guaranties Program, insures the American corporation of being able to convert into dollars up to \$51,000 in French franc receipts from these new investments.

The well-drilling equipment, valued at \$12,000, will be invested by International in Société Française de Forages Layne France, in which International has held 51 percent stock ownership or control. The remainder of the common stock is owned or controlled by a French company, the Société Lyonnaise des Eaux et de l'Eclairage.

This investment, equivalent to 4,178,000 francs, will be part of a 24-million franc increase in the capital of Layne France, from the present 16 million francs to 40 million. The French interests represented by the Société Lyonnaise will contribute 19,822,000 francs of the new capital. The result will be to reduce International's holding to 31 percent of the stock of Layne France.

The Msa guaranty insures the convertibility of up to \$21,000 in receipts from the equipment investment, the remaining \$30,000 of the guaranty covering royalty receipts from the licensing of processes to the French company, estimated at a maximum of \$3,000 a year for 10 years. The processes to be licensed are a development of Layne & Bowler, Inc. of Memphis, an affiliate of International Water.

The guaranty is the 13th granted by Msa under its Investment Guaranties Program to cover an American investment in France. The International Water Corporation investment was approved for a guaranty by the French Government, and by the Director for Mutual Security as required by legislation authorizing the Msa guaranty program.

Msa offers guaranties against loss from expropriation, as well as currency convertibility protection, for new American investments in those countries participating in the mutual security program which have agreements with the United States covering such guaranties. A fee is charged, based on the amount covered by a guaranty. The guaranty contracts are executed by the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

### Calendar of Meetings<sup>1</sup>

#### Adjourned during March 1953

ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):			
Council: 18th Session	Montreal	Jan. 13-Mar. 27	
First Air Navigation Conference	Montreal	Feb. 24-Mar. 24	
FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization):			
Meeting of Group of Experts on Emergency Food Reserve	Rome	Feb. 23-Mar. 7*	
Coordinating Committee: 3d Session	Rome	Mar. 16-28	
Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Defense Science	New Delhi	Feb. 25-Mar. 14	
ILO (International Labor Organization):			
Governing Body: 121st Session	Geneva	Mar. 3-6	
Committee on Work on Plantations: 2d Session	Habana	Mar. 16-28	
Meeting of Governments who are Beneficiaries of Article 16 of Treaty of Peace with Japan—Working Group.	London	Mar. 4-25	
WMO (World Meteorological Organization):			
Commission for Climatology: 1st Session	Washington	Mar. 12-25	
World Symposium on Sferics	Zürich	Mar. 17-20*	
U.N. (United Nations):			
International Children's Emergency Fund:			
Executive Board	New York	Mar. 19-25	
Program Committee	New York	Mar. 19-25	
International Tin Study Group: 7th Meeting	London	Mar. 23-30*	

#### In Session as of March 31, 1953

International Wheat Council: 11th Session	Washington	Jan. 30-
International Wheat Council: 8th Session (Reconvening of)	Washington	Feb. 2-
U.N. (United Nations):		
General Assembly: 7th Session (Reconvening of)	New York	Feb. 24-
Commission on the Status of Women: 7th Session	New York	Mar. 16-
Commission on Narcotic Drugs: 8th Session	New York	Mar. 30-
Economic and Social Council: 15th Session	New York	Mar. 31-
Indian Railway Centenary Exhibition	New Delhi	Mar. 4-
OEEC (Office of European Economic Cooperation): European Inland Transport Conference.	Paris	Mar. 18-
FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): Council Committee on Relations with International Organizations	Rome	Mar. 30-

#### Scheduled April 1-June 30, 1953

WMO (World Meteorological Organization): Commission for Synoptic Meteorology: 1st Session.	Washington	Apr. 2-
U.N. (United Nations):		
Economic Commission for Latin America: 5th Session of the Commission Seminar on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders in Latin American Countries.	Rio de Janeiro	Apr. 6-
Human Rights Commission: 9th Session	Geneva	Apr. 7-
Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor: 4th Session	Geneva	Apr. 17-
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East: Regional Conference on Mineral Resources Development.	Tokyo	Apr. 20-
Fiscal Commission: 4th Session	New York	Apr. 27-
High Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Refugees: 3d Session	Geneva	Apr. 27-
Social Commission: 9th Session	New York	May 4-
International Conference to Adopt a Protocol on Limitation of the Pro- duction of Opium.	New York	May 11-

<sup>1</sup> Prepared in the Division of International Conferences, Department of State, Mar. 27, 1953. Asterisks indicate tentative dates.

*Calendar of Meetings—Continued*

**Scheduled April 1-June 30, 1953—Continued**

**United Nations—Continued**

<i>Ad Hoc</i> Commission on Prisoners of War: 4th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	May 11-
Special Committee to Consider Measures to Limit the Duration of Regular Sessions of the General Assembly . . . . .	New York . . . . .	May 25-
International Law Commission: 5th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 1-
Trusteeship Council: 12th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	June 16-
Economic and Social Council: 16th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 30-
Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June-
International Sugar Conference . . . . .	London* . . . . .	June or July
Technical Assistance Committee . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June-
Interparliamentary Union: Meeting of the Council Caribbean Timbers, Their Utilization and Trade within the Area, Conference on (Caribbean Commission). . . . .	Monaco . . . . .	Apr. 8-
ICEM (Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration): Finance Subcommittee . . . . .	Trinidad . . . . .	Apr. 13-
Fifth Session of Committee . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 16-
Inter-American Seminar on Adult Education . . . . .	Ciudad Trujillo . . . . .	Apr. 14-
Rice Consultative Committee: 6th Session . . . . .	Singapore . . . . .	Apr. 15-
South Pacific Conference: 2d Session . . . . .	Nouméa . . . . .	Apr. 16-
Inter-American Council of Jurists: 2d Meeting . . . . .	Buenos Aires . . . . .	Apr. 20-
PASO (Pan American Sanitary Organization): Executive Committee: 19th Meeting . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	Apr. 20-
FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization): Technical Advisory Committee on Desert Locust Control: 3d Meeting . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Apr. 21-
International Poplar Commission . . . . .	Munster-Munich . . . . .	Apr. 29-
Latin American Seminar on Land Problems . . . . .	São Paulo . . . . .	May 25-
International Chestnut Commission . . . . .	Spain-Portugal . . . . .	May-
Committee on Commodity Problems: 21st Session . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	June 3-
Meeting of the Council: 17th Session . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	June 15-
NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization): Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	Apr. 23-
South Pacific Commission: 11th Session . . . . .	Nouméa . . . . .	Apr. 25-
Icsu (International Council of Scientific Unions): Joint Commission on Physiological Optics . . . . .	Madrid . . . . .	Apr.-
Committee on the International Geophysical Year 1957-1958 . . . . .	Brussels . . . . .	June 30-
Sudan Elections: Mixed Electoral Commission . . . . .	Khartoum . . . . .	Apr.-
ITU (International Telecommunication Union): Administrative Council: 8th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 2-
International Telegraph Consultative Committee: 8th Plenary Assembly . . . . .	Arnhem . . . . .	May 26-
International Cotton Advisory Committee: 12th Plenary Meeting . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	May 4-
UPU (Universal Postal Union): Meeting of the Executive and Liaison Committee . . . . .	Bern . . . . .	May 4-
WHO (World Health Organization): Sixth World Health Assembly . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 5-
Executive Board: 12th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 26-
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization): Standing Committee on Aircraft Performance: 4th Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	May 6-
Assembly: 7th Session . . . . .	Brighton (England) . . . . .	June 16-
Caribbean Commission: 16th Meeting . . . . .	Surinam . . . . .	May 11-
International Rubber Study Group: 10th Meeting . . . . .	Copenhagen . . . . .	May 11-
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization): Executive Board: 34th Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	May 15-
General Conference: 2d Extraordinary Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	May 18-
International Center for Workers Education . . . . .	Compiègne . . . . .	May 30-
International Conference on the Role and Place of Music in Education . . . . .	Brussels . . . . .	June 29-
Tribunales de Cuentas (Tribunals of Accounts): 1st International Congress of . . . . .	Habana . . . . .	May 20-
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 3d Annual Meeting . . . . .	New Haven . . . . .	May 25-
Tenth Congress of the International Seed Testing Association . . . . .	Dublin . . . . .	May 25-
Horticultural Congress and Exposition . . . . .	Hamburg . . . . .	May-
ILO (International Labor Organization): Permanent Agricultural Committee: 4th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May-
36th International Labor Conference . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 4-
Traffic and Safety Exhibition, International . . . . .	Milan . . . . .	May-
American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: Annual Meeting of Directing Council . . . . .	Montevideo . . . . .	June 2-
Eighth Pan American Railway Congress . . . . .	Washington and Atlantic City . . . . .	June 12-
Acoustical Congress . . . . .	Netherlands . . . . .	June 16-
Thirteenth International Dairy Congress and Exposition . . . . .	The Hague . . . . .	June 22-
International Commission for the Regulation of Whaling: 5th Meeting . . . . .	London . . . . .	June 22-
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on Quarantine Regulation (South Pacific Commission) . . . . .	Nouméa . . . . .	June-

## The Soviet Attitude Toward the Disarmament Problem

by Ernest A. Gross

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly<sup>1</sup>

U.S./U.N. press release dated March 21

We have come a full circle, I think, since 3 days ago when the debate on this subject opened in this Committee. At that time, on behalf of the U.S. Government, I asked what we thought were two reasonable questions, addressing them to the representative of the Soviet Government sitting here, and I do not believe that we have had an affirmative response.<sup>2</sup>

The U.S. Government asked two questions: Whether this was the time when the Soviet Government was prepared to discuss constructively the problem of disarmament, and whether this, the United Nations, is the place in which the Soviet Government is prepared to negotiate honestly?

I do not think I need to assure the members of this Committee that these questions were not intended merely as rhetorical exercises, but were a sincere effort to find out whether the new Soviet leadership is really interested in talking seriously about disarmament. They are not difficult questions to answer affirmatively, if the Soviet Government is sincere and interested. We did not request and did not expect a quick debater's answer, and we much prefer, even at this stage, a considered judgment of the Soviet Government, which we do not feel we have yet obtained.

I have said that our purpose in putting the questions to the Soviet representative were sincere, and we cannot conceal some disappointment at the way in which the questions have been treated—that the only reference made to them was on a previous occasion when the Soviet representative branded them as artificial.

We began our work here on this subject in the knowledge that the change in the Soviet Govern-

ment had produced words of peace from the Kremlin, and in this forum which we feel is the appropriate place to do so, my delegation seeks to learn what substance lies behind those words. If we were to be lightly discouraged, the response of the Soviet delegate might lead us to believe that there is no substance there, that the Soviet Government is not prepared to negotiate genuinely and honestly for a disarmament plan at this time. However, we must place our hope for peace above the disappointments which met us here. We must say to the Soviet delegate: "Surely this is not your last word on the subject; surely you would not have us believe that the words of Premier Malenkov were empty words and that the Soviet Union is determined to use the United Nations merely to gain a tactical military or strategic advantage through trick schemes which are labeled disarmament, but which are really designed to strip free nations of their defenses."

If the Soviet Government truly desires peace, will it not in the name of humanity and in the interest of its own people seek the authority through the delegate here to work side by side with us toward a program to effect disarmament which we can all accept, a program which can provide security for us all and a new hope for mankind?

I have felt constrained to make these remarks at the opening of my brief statement because I think that without exception, and I have listened very carefully to two statements by the Soviet representative, no new suggestion has been put forward; there is no real indication in anything which he has said or which the Soviet bloc representatives have said which reveal any true purpose toward reaching a solution on this problem.

We have felt and continue to feel that this is an important and the right time in which to discuss this subject. The balanced reduction of armed forces and of armaments would have incalculable advantages to the Russian people and to other peoples living under Soviet rule, as well

<sup>1</sup> Statement made in Committee I (Political and Security) on Mar. 21. At the same meeting the Committee approved the resolution as amended (A/C. 1/L. 33) by a vote of 50-5-5.

<sup>2</sup> For Ambassador Gross' statement of Mar. 18, see BULLETIN of Mar. 30, 1953, p. 476.

as to people everywhere else in the world. I am sure that these people deeply desire just a little butter instead of so many guns and that they yearn for a decent standard of living; disarmament can yield this to the people of the Soviet Union and to the areas presently under their control. Disarmament can yield this result to these people without in anyway jeopardizing or undermining the security of the Soviet state.

Real disarmament would lift the fear of aggression from all peoples by reducing the capacity, the ability of states to wage aggressive war. This way we can be sure—all peoples including the Russian people—that there would be tangible guarantees of security.

My Government, within a year after the momentous discovery in our country of the war potential of the atom, proposed that the United Nations undertake an effective plan for the international control of atomic energy. Within the same year, we took the initiative in placing before the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission the basic principles of a constructive plan to bring that about. We are confident—we were then and we still are—that this plan could do the job of controlling effectively the atomic weapon and other related weapons as well, since its procedures would actually encompass the entire field of atomic energy.

The world has not forgotten how after the war the United States along with other states in the free world demobilized their forces and disarmed and dismantled a mighty military establishment. We have never since changed our opinion about the method by which the world's resources and energies should be devoted to peace and to improvement of the standard of living. We have always supported the U.N. plans and principles which are designed to lift the crushing burden of armament, but to do so in an effective, a practical, and an honest manner.

The distinguished representative of the Netherlands in his statement in the Committee yesterday pointed out the vital importance of avoiding the illusion of security. He said, "We must shun sham solutions and there is no such thing as a short cut to peace and security." It does not come so much as a matter of surprise as a matter of disappointment that the Soviet representative should repeat today again the old outworn and utterly impractical suggestion that somehow, as he says, a decision should precede a practical plan for accomplishing the very result which the decision is aimed to accomplish.

The Soviet representative in his two statements here has failed to refer to the simple fact that the United Nations itself by overwhelming majorities has stated its position and has made its objectives and general procedures clear. The resolution of January 11, 1952,<sup>3</sup> establishing the Disarmament

Commission, omits no major aspect of the disarmament problem. The Soviet representative referred to proposals placed before the Disarmament Commission, speaking as if a proposal for ceilings upon armed forces was made without reference to other aspects of the disarmament program, including the effective measures for eliminating the atomic weapon and other methods of mass destruction. The U.N. General Assembly has spoken its mind on these subjects. The General Assembly has called for the regulation, the limitation, and the balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments. It has called for the elimination of all major weapons adaptable to mass destruction. It has called for the effective international control of atomic energy to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. And in this connection, it has provided that the Disarmament Commission should use the present U.N. plan as the basis for the Commission's consideration until a better or no less effective plan is devised.

#### **U.N. Disarmament Aims Made Clear**

Then the General Assembly in 1952 called for a progressive and continuing disclosure and verification of all armed forces and all armaments, including atomic, and recognized that the carrying out of such a program for disclosure and verification is the first and indispensable step in achieving a disarmament program.

We fail to understand how it can be seriously advanced as an apparently honest argument that before disclosure and verification is carried out, before states tell the truth and assure that what they tell is the truth, that some magic purpose is to be served by some decision which assumes the result and which is based upon ignorance of the facts.

Mr. Chairman, in his statement 2 days ago, the Soviet representative made some remarks which were out of context, which did not accurately reflect the positions taken in the Disarmament Commission and which I believe it is fair to say distorted the objectives and efforts on the part of my Government in the Disarmament Commission. I do not intend to go extensively into these distortions, nor these misquotations, but I should like to cite two for illustrative purposes.

I said in this Committee on Wednesday that in the Disarmament Commission the Soviet representative had consistently declined to explain the meaning of vague and ambiguous proposals which he had put forward and that he had characterized our efforts to secure explanations and clarifications of these points as, to use his words, "playing with questions and answers."

The Soviet representative in this Committee has replied that there is no word of truth in this contention. The Soviet representative then went on

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 31, 1952, p. 507.

at length to quote from Soviet proposals made to the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission on June 19, 1947, in order to establish that the Soviet Government had in fact introduced very detailed proposals for the establishment of international control of atomic energy.

It is, of course, entirely true that the Soviet Government in 1947 did introduce proposals into the Atomic Energy Commission and that these proposals were considerably more detailed than the Soviet Government has put forward since that time. In fact, the Soviet proposals of 1947 were sufficiently detailed to permit the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission to study them and to determine soberly that they were wholly inadequate.

To quote from the third report of the Atomic Energy Commission, "They"—that is, the Soviet proposals made at that time in 1947—"ignore the existing technical knowledge of the problem of atomic energy control, do not provide an adequate basis for the effective international control of atomic energy and the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons, and, therefore, do not conform to the terms of reference of the Atomic Energy Commission."

So spoke the Commission with regard to these 1947 proposals, and the General Assembly of the United Nations confirmed this decision of the Atomic Energy Commission in November of 1948, through adopting the third report of the Atomic Energy Commission and through rejecting the Soviet resolution which called upon the Assembly to approve its proposals.

Now, the purpose of the questions which we and other members of the Disarmament Commission addressed to the Soviet representative there and which he declined to answer was to determine whether the Soviet proposals which the Soviet Government was then making in the Disarmament Commission were new proposals or whether they were the same old proposals which had been advanced and rejected. Members of the Committee will recall that in the General Assembly on January 11, 1952, Mr. Vyshinsky stated that the Soviet Government would make new proposals in the Disarmament Commission. As I explained in my statement the other day, despite our persistent efforts in the Disarmament Commission to find out whether the broad, general, vague, and ambiguous proposals of the Soviet Government in the Disarmament Commission were new proposals of a sort which Mr. Vyshinsky had promised or whether they were the same old proposals, our attempt to find out the answer to that question elicited no reply. It may be that Mr. Zorin has given us the answer to this question through quoting the 1947 proposals. In other words, despite the statement of Mr. Vyshinsky on January 11, 1952, that he had new proposals, it now appears that all we had were the same old proposals which the General Assembly had found to be inadequate.

I do not make this as a statement. It is a question. It is a question which we feel can only be answered in the Disarmament Commission itself.

It seems clear to my delegation, Mr. Chairman, that it will not be possible to obtain anything but debaters' answers in the Committee. As I said before, it was not my purpose in asking the two questions I addressed to the Soviet representative the other day to elicit a quick debater's answer. We ourselves look to the future. We hope that the past will bury the stale propaganda, the monstrous lies, the evasions, the hate campaigns, which have in the past characterized the Soviet Government conduct in international community.

In looking back over the work of the Commission, it has not been our purpose to reawaken the memory of old evils. If we look back over our shoulder at the frustrated work of the Disarmament Commission, it is not to score a debating point but to see more clearly the direction in which we must go.

For us, peace is not merely an objective. It is a way of living and it is a method of negotiating and settling disputes honestly, including disputes regarding disarmament. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this debate in the Committee regarding disarmament has by any means been wasted effort or lost motion. We have, for our part, reaffirmed our intention to proceed in the Disarmament Commission to a full exploration of all practical and honest proposals which may be put forward.

#### **Soviet Draft Resolution**

I conclude by referring to the Soviet draft resolution which is before us.\* This resolution does not give much room for optimism or for confidence. The preamble to the resolution is purely propaganda. The General Assembly and the members of the United Nations, in particular those who are represented in the Disarmament Commission, are fully aware of the true reasons for lack of progress in the Disarmament Commission. They, I think, are fully aware that 11 states on the Disarmament Commission made or supported constructive proposals and that one state alone wished to use the discussions solely for propaganda purposes. The resolution proposed by the Soviet representative would undo a great deal of the progress which was made in Paris at the Sixth General Assembly of the United Nations, and which resulted in the resolution of January 11, 1952, to which I have referred.

Among other things, that resolution directed the Disarmament Commission to prepare proposals "for the regulation, limitation, and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments." The Soviet draft resolution proposes armaments

\*U.N. doc. A/C. 1/L 31.

reduction without any reference to armed forces whatever. The General Assembly resolution of January 11, 1952, provided that the Disarmament Commission should be ready to consider any proposals or plans for control that may be put forward involving either conventional armaments or atomic energy. Unless a better or no less effective system is devised, the U. N. plan for the international control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons should continue to serve as the basis for the international control of atomic energy to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

The Soviet resolution throws all this progress out the window. In effect, it abandons or seeks to abandon the U.N. atomic energy plan and only calls upon the Disarmament Commission to proceed with the question of the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons, bacterial weapons, and other types of mass destruction, and of the establishment of strict international control over compliance with these decisions.

The General Assembly resolution of January 11, 1952, directs the Commission to formulate plans for the establishment within the framework of the Security Council or an international control organ or organs to assure the implementation of the treaty or treaties which the resolution contemplates. In other words, the entire disarmament program is to be subject to safeguards.

The Soviet draft resolution limits the safeguards, so-called safeguards, to international control merely over compliance with decisions regarding the prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. There is no provision for control over other portions of the program such as the reduction of weapons other than those adaptable to mass destruction or the reduction in armed forces.

We recognize that in this resolution for the first time the Soviet Government has admitted by implication the possibility of reduction of nonatomic armaments on a basis other than a flat percentage cut. If I am not mistaken, to my knowledge, this is the first resolution proposed by the Soviet Government which does not call for a flat one-third percentage cut. I sincerely hope that this is an indication of greater flexibility and a desire for a genuine negotiation on this all-important problem. When the Disarmament Commission reconvenes, we shall have a clear test of Soviet intentions. Under the General Assembly resolution of January 11, 1952, and the draft resolution which has now been submitted by 14 cosponsors before the Committee<sup>5</sup>—under these resolutions, the Soviet Government will be in a position to make new disarmament proposals of any nature, and I assure you that my Government will give the most careful and sympathetic consideration to any pro-

posal which has any possibility of achieving a genuinely safeguarded system of disarmament.

For these reasons, my Government will vote against the Soviet draft resolution which we believe the Committee should reject decisively and will, of course, vote in favor of the 14-power resolution.

## Senate Resolution on Minorities Transmitted to U.N.

U.S./U.N. press release dated March 13

*The following letter and its enclosure were transmitted on March 13 by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., to U.N. Secretary-General Trygve Lie:*

**EXCELLENCY:** Enclosed are copies of a resolution (S. Res. 84, 83rd Congress, 1st Session) adopted on February 27, 1953, by the Senate of the United States, expressing the sense of the Senate that the inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against religious and ethnic minority groups deserve the strongest condemnation.

I request that you transmit copies of the resolution and of this communication to the Representative of each Member of the United Nations.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.  
Ambassador

### RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

February 27, 1953

*S. Res. 84, 83rd Congress, 1st Session*

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic and Balkan States and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

*Resolved further*, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages, in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its Charter.

<sup>5</sup> U.N. doc. A/C.1/L30.

## International Aspects of the Status of Women

*Statements by Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn*

*U.S. Representative on the Commission on the Status of Women<sup>1</sup>*

### NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

U.S./U.N. press release dated March 16

The United States has repeatedly voiced its interest in equality for women in the field of nationality and in the development of a convention incorporating the principles adopted by this Commission in 1950. The report of the International Law Commission indicates that it is making progress in reviewing the whole problem of nationality. We are glad that the International Law Commission has been able to initiate this study. The material gathered at the request of the Commission on the Status of Women on conflicts of law relating to the nationality of married women should be useful. I hope the valuable supplement (doc. E/Cn.6/206) prepared for our use this year will also be brought to the attention of the International Law Commission.

Some criticism has been voiced because the principles adopted here 3 years ago have not yet been made into a special convention on the nationality of married women. For the time being our nationality item must be regarded as "unfinished business," and everyone likes to see "unfinished business" completed and off the agenda. However, the United States does not regard this delay as lost time. On the contrary, the supplementary report provided this year shows that a number of countries are revising their nationality laws in the direction of the principles adopted by the Commission and already in force in many countries.

U.S. law already conforms with these principles, and the United States is a party to the Inter-American Convention signed at Montevideo in 1933 which contains the same basic provisions. It seems probable that our recommendations of this Commission have had a considerable influence on legislation enacted since 1950, and will make it

possible for a larger number of countries to support and become parties to a convention along the lines we recommend. I want to talk further about this report a little later on. In the meantime, it is enough to note that only 17 countries are listed as requiring an alien wife to accept her husband's nationality, and over 40 as permitting choice under varying conditions. At least 10 countries have improved their laws since our 1950 report. This is a good omen for a convention of the type we recommend; indeed, without the 10, acceptance of these principles might not be certain.

Another question that has been raised in regard to the study of the International Law Commission is whether the nationality of married women should be dealt with in a separate convention or in one that may cover a wider range of nationality questions. This question was never fully dealt with in the Commission on the Status of Women because it was evident that we were dealing with only a part of a large field, and though the confusions arising for families of mixed nationality are very great, we could not be sure in this one Commission that we could make wise judgments on U.N. action as a whole. It is on this question, on the scope of a new convention in the nationality field, that the United Nations especially needs the advice of the experts on the International Law Commission. The United States hopes that the 1953 session of this Commission can give specific guidance on this matter. The situation of women who marry aliens is an international question that can be dealt with separately and should be dealt with promptly. It is not, however, a problem which exists in a vacuum, apart from other aspects of nationality.

### Interrelationships of Nationality Procedures

Perhaps I can illustrate the interrelationships of nationality procedures best by citing two problems—the situation of children born to couples of differing nationality and the multiple nationality

<sup>1</sup> Made before the Commission on the Status of Women at U. N. Headquarters on Mar. 16, 17, and 25, respectively. Mrs. Hahn was confirmed by the Senate on Mar. 11 to be U.S. representative on the Commission.

enjoyed, or should I say suffered, by individuals who can claim citizenship in several countries by reason of birth, residence, parentage, naturalization, and other grounds.

The situation of children born to parents of differing nationality is one in which women naturally feel an interest, and most of us probably know of one or more young people facing complications on property settlements or conscription requirements because they have more than one nationality. Most countries recognize persons born on their soil as nationals. In addition, it is usual to allow a child to derive nationality from his father, and, in some countries also from his mother. This may mean that a child born in one country to parents having nationality in two other countries can claim citizenship in three countries. Generally it is provided that on maturity a child must choose one of these nationalities for his own, thereby renouncing others, but provisions of this sort vary and few of them come into effect early enough to prevent conflicting claims from countries which require young men to go into military training at 18.

Consideration of the nationality of children is not the function of this Commission, for the welfare of the child should be the determining factor, and on this the Social Commission and various others are the appropriate bodies to take the lead. However, there is no doubt that governments are harassed by conflicting claims to the allegiance of persons who have multiple nationality, and that a clarification of procedures would be welcomed. In our debate in 1950 the United States tried to work out one principle that might be applicable, the principle that if a child receives nationality through parentage, rather than through place of birth or some other source, then the mother should have the same right to transmit nationality as the father. It will allow the child the benefit of choice, which may be greatly to his advantage, particularly if the nationality of his father is unknown. This was not included in the principles we adopted but was recommended for consideration by appropriate bodies. The International Law Commission is such a body, and it is the hope of my Government that when it studies this problem, it will recognize the right of the mother to transmit nationality as equal to that of the father.

Women may also have problems of nationality which do not arise from marriage. Such problems are usually the same for men and women, and arise through parentage, changes of frontiers, and other factors. It is problems of this sort to which the International Law Commission will undoubtedly be giving attention in its study of nationality, and women stand to gain by any clarifications that can be agreed upon. I am sure these problems have been present in the thinking of some of our consultant organizations who have queried whether we have given adequate thought to the

entire subject of nationality of women, including problems of single women. It is therefore to the advantage of both men and women that the field of nationality be properly studied and a careful decision made as to what questions can usefully be clarified at the present time through a nationality convention.

Certainly it will help when there is general agreement among governments that neither marriage nor its dissolution shall affect the nationality of either spouse. These principles are in effect in U.S. law, and it will be easier for our Government, and our citizens, when they are stated as the uniform procedure of as many countries as possible. If, however, there are other nationality questions on which wide-scale agreement is becoming possible, governments should have an opportunity to deal with them promptly, and we will all profit by the result. A separate instrument devoted only to the nationality of married women might delay such overall consideration and discourage progress on other problems.

#### **Changing Circumstances Necessitate Convention**

There may be some who interpret the action of the International Law Commission last summer as unsympathetic, or even a repudiation of the recommendations adopted by this Commission. The United States notes with satisfaction that no such conclusion should be drawn from the record. On the contrary, we can feel satisfaction that while the International Law Commission did not accept the draft convention proposed by Prof. Manley Hudson, it did not reject either the draft or the principles contained therein. The decision of the International Law Commission last July was merely one of procedure to permit study of the full implications of nationality in relation to the many new developments of modern life. After all, a good deal has happened since the Hague convention in 1930 and the Montevideo conference in 1933 to which we trace back present-day proposals on the nationality of women. The General Assembly last December adopted a convention on statelessness which cuts into some of our problem. Today there are matters of property rights and taxation, and of business management which may be considerably affected by an individual's nationality, particularly in other countries than the United States. There are U.S. women in international business today to whom these are important issues, and I am sure others around this table know women in their countries with similar interests. I am not suggesting that these or any other aspects of nationality need to be treated in a convention, but I am sure we will agree that our problems should be solved in relation to the vast sweep of modern interchange, and that the International Law Commission should be encouraged to do a thorough job.

Now I want to talk about the future of this item

on nationality, over and beyond the completion of a convention. What we want, I am sure, is the assurance that men and women who marry across frontiers can do so without fear as to their nationality or the nationality of their children. A convention will help greatly in defining a standard around which equitable procedures can be established between governments. But the completion of a draft convention in the International Law Commission, and its approval by the General Assembly, will be only the beginning of this process. We hope, of course, that many governments will ratify such a convention promptly, and that the remainder will do so before many years pass. In the meantime, there will be great differences between countries as there are now. Even among the parties to the convention there will be a great deal of difference in the way its principles are spelled out, and probably in the procedures by which they become effective between the parties.

The changes reported in the Secretary General's memorandum on nationality of married women this year illustrate the progress that is being made and what will happen in the transition years and beyond. As I said earlier, the laws in many countries, including the United States, permit a married woman to keep her own nationality. Most countries also make special provision for the naturalization of foreigners who marry their citizens. As I recall it, these principles had been adopted in about half the countries of the world. Today, thanks to recent changes, the proportion is considerably greater. Most of the new laws show a realistic appreciation of problems in the transition period. For instance, in Belgium a wife who has acquired Belgian nationality by marriage, and has or can recover another nationality, may renounce Belgian nationality by making a declaration within 6 months. This provision insures against statelessness and at the same time provides freedom of choice. In Egypt an alien woman marrying an Egyptian may retain her nationality unless she desires to acquire her husband's, a provision in the direction of equality with freedom of choice and protection against double nationality. In Norway, where a foreign woman automatically acquires the nationality of a Norwegian husband, she may under certain circumstances be released provided she possesses another nationality or intends to acquire it. Switzerland has recently adopted legislation permitting an alien wife to reattain her own nationality through a declaration at the time of marriage.

These are only a few of the possible variations; if we review laws in effect in other countries we would find still more. One of the elements of great value in these changes is concern to prevent a woman becoming stateless. This is apparent also in various provisions I have not quoted to permit a woman whose marriage has been dissolved to recover her original nationality. Some

of these provisions do not accord in principle with the recommendation of this Commission that marriage should not affect the nationality of either spouse, but in actuality they give general effect to this principle through practical safeguards needed in a transition period.

#### **Progress Anticipated on Women's Status**

The Secretary General's memorandum is of a type which will be helpful to my Government and to every other government. It summarizes the latest information from all countries and brings up to date the 1950 pamphlet which is already a recognized reference document. There are many governments which collect such data through their embassies and maintain their own files. But there are occasional omissions even in the best reporting systems and an authoritative collection of nationality laws affecting women is a valuable check on what is known from other sources. This information is needed not only as a basis for official decisions but more frequently, and perhaps equally important, to answer the questions of young people or older people who are about to marry and want to know what problems they will face. A document like this would be even more useful if it could be brought out at regular intervals, preferably once a year. The United States would like to ask whether the Secretary General believes it would be practicable to place this memorandum on an annual basis similar to the procedure for the memorandum on political rights. This would also mean keeping nationality as a routine item on our agenda so that we can review the report and also determine how long it should be continued.

The Secretary General may have suggestions on the form of an annual memorandum on nationality, particularly as to additional categories of information. The tables at the end of this document cover the effect of marriage on acquisition of nationality by the alien spouse, but do not show clearly whether a woman marrying an alien may retain her own nationality if she so desires. The questions usually asked by women considering marriage to a foreigner are (1) Can I retain my own nationality; (2) Must I acquire my husband's nationality, temporarily or permanently; (3) Will I be in danger of becoming stateless; (4) Are there special provisions for naturalization of alien spouses. Tables setting up warning signals as to retention of nationality and statelessness would be especially helpful. It seems a little easier to find particular countries, also, when they are listed alphabetically with the pertinent information laid out in columns beside them.

In closing, I would like to say a little in appreciation of the interest our consultant organizations have maintained in this project. For some of them the problems of nationality have been the subject of discussion for two generations, back

into the time of our mothers and perhaps our grandmothers. There have been great gains in this period. In the Americas the Montevideo Convention on the Nationality of Women is a milestone. Eleven of our American Republics are parties to this convention, which provides that neither marriage nor its dissolution shall affect a woman's nationality. The adoption of equality principles by the Commission on the Status of Women in 1950 is another milestone. A milestone has been set by each country which has revised its nationality laws to provide free and equal choice by each of the marriage partners.

As in all matters involving international procedure, the first milestones are the hardest to achieve; as the new way becomes the usual way it is easier to conform than to differ. At the same time, we need not think of our objectives as uniformity. If we work intelligently the chances are we will constantly be finding ways to improve legislation; that is evident already in some of the new provisions to prevent statelessness and clarify choices for both men and women. The report before us today promises a time when international conferences of women may be able to do without the familiar speech on "Problems of Nationality." Instead of problems, however, I would like to see us look forward to a series of progress reports. The observations of our consultant organizations will be important in helping this Commission evaluate progress and to point out the areas where more can be done.

#### **WOMEN'S STATUS IN THE FAMILY**

U.S./U.N. press release dated March 17

As a new member of the Commission it is therefore very gratifying to me that the subject of women's status in the family will be under discussion for the first time at this session and that it has been given highest priority.

As we begin our discussion it is my privilege to express the appreciation of my Government for the extensive work of the Secretary General's staff in compiling the reports from official sources on women's status under family law and property law and also in making available the independent reports and comments of the nongovernmental organizations. The detailed information contained in these documents will be invaluable as a basis for consideration of women's needs and problems. I feel sure that all of you will have studied the documents with great interest and care and a sense of the enormous responsibilities before us. As our discussions proceed, I know there will be additional information which you will probably want from me and which I in turn will want to know from other countries.

I regard our work on the family status of woman as one of the most important aspects of woman's position with which this Commission will be called upon to deal. Family law—the set

of legal principles which govern marriage, the relationship of husband to wife, and of parents to children—touches every aspect of human life. Women's status in the family directly affects the contribution which women are able to make to the economic, social, and cultural life of their country, and thereby to the whole progress of civilization. In seeking to understand each other's needs and problems in this area we have an opportunity to formulate principles as to the equitable treatment of women in marriage which will be of potential benefit not only to women themselves but to the whole fabric of our society.

The age in which we are living has seen numerous and far-reaching changes in the status of women. Women everywhere are striving to realize their full potentialities as individuals and to make their maximum contribution to the society in which they live. It was my privilege to have a part in shaping or directing the postwar development of this movement in one of the war-torn countries when I had charge in the late 40's of organizing the Women's Affairs Branch for the U. S. Army in Germany. Guarantees made to women in the Bonn Constitution, which had just been adopted at that time, are now receiving consideration as to legal implementation. Our discussions here will be of vital interest to women working for legislative action to implement that Constitution and to women in other countries where to a constantly increasing extent the reciprocal rights and obligations of women are receiving recognition in terms of the greater contribution to human welfare which such recognition would make possible.

#### **Legal Complications in Various Countries**

In reading the extensive documentation on family law supplied us by the Secretary General, I was impressed by the scope and variety of legal principles which we are called upon to consider in the various countries. I note, for example, that in some countries only the father has the right to exercise authority over the care, custody, and education of the children. This situation was reported from Greece, Argentina, Chile, and Brazil. In some countries, such power belongs jointly to the father and mother, including Japan, Norway, Turkey, and Denmark. In still other countries, such as England and France, parental authority is vested jointly in the father and mother, but the father alone has the right to exercise it during marriage. Still another variation is Lebanon, where so far as concerns the care and custody, general and religious education, and the right of punishment, the report shows that the mother has authority over children up to the age of 7 in the case of boys, and 9 in the case of girls. After those ages, these rights pass to the father. In Pakistan, also, the mother has custody of the son until he is 7, and of the daughter until she reaches puberty.

An additional complication of which I was aware but which the reports have brought more vividly to my attention is that in countries established on the Federal-State basis, legal principles may, and often do, vary within the same country. In my own country, for example, laws relating to the family and to property rights are the exclusive jurisdiction of the States, not of the Federal Government. Because of historical factors and original differences in customs and backgrounds, there is considerable variation in the statute laws of the 48 States. Each State differs in some respect from all the others.

In the area that I have just been discussing—that of the right of control over the child—over half of the States (26 States) recognize both parents as joint natural guardians and as such jointly entitled to the child's custody, services, and earnings. However, about a third of our States (15 States) give the father the first right to a child's custody, services, and earnings, permitting the mother to succeed only after the father's death, mental incapacity or desertion. Eight States that have the community-property system of law consider the child's earnings as joint property but generally under control of the father.

In the field of property law, such documentation as has been made available to date from the various countries shows that here also the legal principles with which we will be called upon to deal are of great variety and complexity. I was interested, in the recent report (E/CN.6/208), to note that the laws in the countries reporting establish three main types of property arrangements between husband and wife: the regime of community property, dowry, and separate property. In addition, a system of "union" property regime prevails in China; and a system of the "family estate" exists only in the Italian Civil Code. Moreover, the report shows that in India and Pakistan property rights are based on religious law and that such rights differ in accordance with the religious community to which the woman belongs. Thus a Hindu woman may have absolute ownership only to property acquired before marriage and to earnings acquired during marriage. Even this property may be taken and used by the husband in certain contingencies. In contrast under Mohammedan law, in both those countries and also in Lebanon, a Moslem woman may hold property separately and have full power to dispose of it.

To illustrate the variety and complexity of the subject of property relations between husband and wife, I need go no further than the laws of my own country. Two systems of property rights prevail in the United States: one, the system derived from the English common law in which the husband and wife hold separate and distinct property; the other, the community-property system derived from the Spanish civil law, in which a marriage partnership of property is recognized, husband and wife being partners and equal owners

of the community estate. In the two systems the rules of acquisition of property, its management and control, and its disposition differ today as they differed in the original systems in which the rules had their source.

#### **Equitable Treatment of Family Status**

In every common law State married woman's property acts have been enacted during the last 100 years, which have radically changed the husband's common law rights in his wife's real and personal property and have also generally altered the rule as to his ownership of his wife's earnings from work outside of her home and for persons other than her husband. Property acquired during the marriage is regarded as the property of the husband subject to certain safeguards which the law attaches in the interest of the wife and family. The proceeds of the wife's work in her home are still very generally regarded as belonging to her husband and he is under no legal obligations to pay her for such services.

In the eight States with a community-property system, with fundamental rules derived from the law of Spain directly, or indirectly by way of Mexico (or in the case of Louisiana by way of France), the property rights of husband and wife differ markedly from those in our common law States. Under this system all property which the husband and wife acquire belongs equally to both of them, except that which is proved to belong to either of them separately. The proceeds of the labor of each becomes a part of the common or community property, in which the wife has the same extent of ownership as the husband. The marriage is a partnership; and its property like that in any other partnership is primarily liable for the payment of its debts. The husband, however, usually has the sole management of the community property during marriage.

In view of these divergencies in laws and customs, I have come to realize that for me at least it would be most helpful if at this session, if in place of addressing ourselves to specific statutory discriminations, we would undertake to reach agreement on objectives or standards designed to bring equity to women. The broader area of objectives and standards offer us a common meeting ground, so that if we direct our discussions to this area, I believe we would have some expectation of reaching agreement as to the basic principles designed to bring equitable treatment to women under law.

In order to lay a solid basis on which to arrive at constructive suggestions, I would personally find it most helpful if we might center the discussion this year around normal family relationships as distinguished from special problems. Although the reports show a great deal that is outside of U. S. law and experience, it would be most helpful to discuss normal family relationships in terms of the religious, economic, and social back-

ground and customs of the various countries. In this way, all of us would gain an insight into the needs of women in other countries and learn to understand their problems. What we might expect to come out of such a program would be a set of principles on family law and property relations which women themselves would accept as equitable and which could be expected to add to the dignity of the family relationship and to strengthen, not weaken, the fabric of our society.

As a start, we have the basic standards set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The preamble of the Declaration states that:

the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

In arriving at a set of principles consistent with the spirit and purpose of these accepted human values there are several major areas of family law to which I believe we might well give priority. One of the areas that suggests itself as appropriate for early discussion is the institution of marriage. What is the purpose and what are the sanctities of marriage in our differing legal and religious systems? Viewed against the economic and social background of the individual country concerned, what should be the rights and obligations of woman with respect to entrance into marriage, choice of a partner, age of consent? Once a marriage is consummated, what constitutes a mutually satisfactory relationship between husband and wife during marriage? What should be their reciprocal rights and obligations with respect to responsibility for family support, control of children, choice of domicile? What principles governing the control of property acquired after marriage would both insure justice to the parties concerned and promote the welfare of the family? What standards should be applied in dealing with (a) the separate property of the wife, and (b) the property acquired through the joint efforts of both partners?

Our discussions of this topic will give us an opportunity to examine the laws that govern the position of women in the family and to determine what should be the reciprocal rights and obligations of women in the light of existing conditions in the various countries. On the basis of this discussion we may hope to arrive at an understanding as to the underlying principles which will insure the equitable treatment of women in marriage, safeguard the rights and obligations of motherhood, and promote the welfare of the family as the basic institution of our society. The approach I am suggesting may prove to be a long, hard road and it may not easily be finished in one or even two annual sessions. However, since it affords the possibility of constructive help in promoting the family status of women in all our countries, I believe it would be well worth the effort.

## EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

U.S./U.N. press release dated March 25

We endorse wholeheartedly the principle of the fullest educational opportunities for women. We wish to re-emphasize our belief that education should always be considered in terms of the individual without any discrimination on the basis of sex. This is the philosophy prevailing throughout the United States, embodied in the educational pattern in each one of the 48 States and the various territories under our jurisdiction.

In the United States, education is regarded as a right, available to all children, girls or boys, regardless of the economic or social status of the family. We are fully in accord with the statement of the Fifteenth International Conference on Public Education at Geneva in 1952, "that every person, man or woman, should be able to receive an education enabling him to develop his aptitudes as fully as possible, plan an effective part as a member or citizen of his community, his nation, and the world, and meet the demands of his special tasks in life."

As was indicated in this country's report to that conference, the constitutions of all our states make it obligatory to organize free public-school facilities for all children, and provide either explicitly or implicitly for equal educational opportunities regardless of sex. The duration and the age limits of compulsory education are the same for girls as for boys; all public elementary schools and the great majority of the public high schools are coeducational, there is equal access to all types of vocational and technical training and to higher education, the great majority of all post-secondary institutions being coeducational.

Even the economic and social factors which sometimes affect the opportunity of women for higher education are becoming less and less significant as earlier prejudices are outgrown and employment opportunities open in a wider and wider range of professions and occupations. Today it would be practically impossible to cite any kind of job for which a qualified woman could not obtain appropriate educational training in the United States. As early as 1930 women were employed in all but 30 of the 534 occupations in the census list of that year. By 1940 there were only 9 in which no woman was employed and by 1943 the admission of women to the various military services left only 3, now there is virtually no occupation in which there are not a few women successfully performing a job.

### Promoting Ideals of Democracy

Furthermore, we have discovered and proved again and again the validity of the truism, "educate a woman and you have educated a family—and a community." Every woman is to some extent an educator, whether or not she is a member

of the teaching profession. In the home she helps her children put into practice the learning experiences acquired in the schools, trains them in good health and living habits, and takes a leading role in developing family attitudes and in transmitting the ideals of democracy. In the community, she carries her housekeeping ability and her desire for clean and safe surroundings for her family into the organizing of health and welfare services and of public-service organizations of many kinds for bettering her neighborhood. She has been concerned to see that the water and food supply are kept clean and pure, and that effective sanitation facilities and safe streets are provided.

It may be reassuring to some countries where there is still latent opposition to higher education for women to discover that educated women in this country have a real interest in being wives and mothers—in recent years three-fourths of our women college graduates marry, and current statistics show an upward trend in the number of their children. A recent questionnaire to college graduates showed that many feel they are better mothers because of their education, better in understanding, training and rearing their children, and more able to help and guide them.

Recent trends in American education have tended to focus the whole school curriculum in the direction of education for family and community living. Experience indicates that both men and women can profit by broad instruction in relation to family life, including the joint responsibilities and privileges undertaken in marriage and parenthood. Life adjustment courses in secondary schools and for adults are growing in American schools and communities. Through experiments in both rural and urban areas, schools at the elementary as well as the more advanced level are orienting their teaching toward the raising of living standards in the whole community, by making scientific knowledge available in a form which can be used by young children and their parents, and by developing in applying such knowledge to the raising of living standards.

The concept of the school as a community center rather than merely a place of instruction for children has grown markedly in recent years. School buildings are used for adult education and other community purposes outside the formal school hours. Such school activities as the school-lunch program, greatly influence the life of the community. The growth of informal educational programs, such as agricultural extension, labor education, and educational activities of libraries further reflects the trend toward relating education directly to problems of democratic living.

Responsibility of the community for its schools also reflects the processes of democratic participation—processes in which women as citizens play an important part. It has always been the principle of the American public-school system that

policy making and ultimate control of the schools shall lie in the hands of citizens of each locality rather than in the hands of the government or of professional educators. School boards elected by the citizenry, on which women and men both serve, are the governing bodies of American public schools. The Parent Teacher Association, which brings together parents and teachers to consider needs of children and school, provides a further channel for participation by women of the community in planning for and promoting the education of their children.

Education for responsible citizenship and democratic participation has always been a major objective of American education. Such education first took the form of school courses in civics. In most schools, these courses, limited to the structure and processes of government, have been replaced by courses which integrate the study of history, civics, and other social sciences, and address themselves to "Problems of Democracy." Student organizations within the school are patterned on national, state, or local government and provide boys and girls with direct experience in the responsible use of democratic procedures. Within the classroom, democratic processes are used as a consciously developed teaching method, and emphasis is placed on developing the ability to evaluate facts and to engage in public discussion which is basic to democracy.

#### Interest in Public Affairs

These educational developments have been reflected in the role played by American women in their participation in State and Federal activities for the general welfare and for international peace and security. Citizenship training is reflected especially in improved standards of local government for which women have worked vigorously as part of their responsibility for the family. It is reflected also in the activity of women's organizations to improve laws and their administration through honest government, sound judicial procedures, and positive public programs relating to health, education, and welfare. Possibly its strongest reflection is in the contributions of women's organizations to education. The experience in parliamentary law and effective conduct of discussion which women have obtained in their organizations, in trade unions, and also in formal classes in schools has proved of great value for women in their political life.

The interaction between the fact that women are increasingly well educated and increasingly concerned with public affairs is reflected in the development of women's magazines. The interaction between women's magazines and their readers has steadily raised the level of public discussion in those magazines until they have become principal forums for the discussion of important issues, read by men as well as by women. Women

and women's organizations have been in the lead in developing and supporting voluntary welfare services, in the study of social problems, and in support of local and national legislation to deal with these problems. They have frequently paved the way for men and women to work together on these matters through labor unions and other citizen groups.

A comprehensive study of the education of women in the United States will be carried on by a newly established commission on women's education of the American Council on Education. It will explore the current and long-range needs resulting from the impact of changing social conditions upon women as individuals, members of families, career women, citizens, and as creators and perpetuators of values. It will include a con-

sideration of women in faculty and administrative positions in higher education, the opportunities for women students in colleges and universities, and the development of plans for continuing the education of women at the adult level.

The woman who plays a significant and constructive role in the world today will be the woman whose clarity of thinking, whose experience, standards, and judgments can raise the cultural sights of her family and contribute to their psychological and emotional well-being. She is the woman who brings to her profession or business a wider range of vision, who is conscious of her responsibilities as a citizen in a democracy and does something about it. In other words, her education has trained her to be a good member of society.

## The United States in the United Nations

[March 19-25]

### General Assembly

*Committee I (Political and Security)*—The U.S.S.R. on March 19 submitted a resolution determining that the Disarmament Commission, especially the United States, France, and the United Kingdom, had repeatedly attempted to substitute for the question of armaments reduction "that of illegally obtaining intelligence reports on the armaments of individual states." The Soviet draft would direct the Disarmament Commission to proceed forthwith with the study of practical measures to achieve armaments reduction, particularly among the five Great Powers, and with the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction, and the establishment of strict international control. The Disarmament Commission would be asked to report back to the Security Council and the General Assembly not later than July 1.

Before introducing his resolution, Valerian Zorin (U.S.S.R.) brushed aside the questions put to him March 18 by Ambassador Ernest A. Gross, as to whether the Soviets were willing to discuss disarmament constructively in the United Nations. He declared that the U.S.S.R. had consistently advocated armaments reduction and prohibition of atomic energy as the greatest guaranties of peace.

Speaking in support of the 14-power resolution, D. J. von Balluseck (Netherlands) noted the fundamental difference in approach as between the West and the U.S.S.R. It was essential, he said,

to begin with the question of disclosure and verification. The U.S.S.R., however, wanted to start at the "far end" with reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons. There would be no value in such premature decisions, which might only continue the imbalance of power. A system of checks and balances was needed.

Leslie K. Munro (New Zealand) pointed out that clear and explicit answers to Ambassador Gross' questions of March 18 would "help us to assess" the prospects of making progress in disarmament. Recalling Premier Malenkov's recent "peace policy" statements, he noted that press reports of a *Pravda* article advocating an all-out drive to strengthen Soviet power were a "depressing sequel."

Speaking for the United Kingdom, Sir Gladwyn Jebb also referred to Premier Malenkov's talk of peace and proposed that if he really wanted to settle all outstanding problems peaceably, he would do well to start in the Disarmament Commission. Even if the new Soviet Government could just take a new look at the whole disarmament problem and try to get away from stale slogans, some progress would be achieved.

At the March 20 meeting of the Committee, Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and Yemen jointly introduced amendments to the 14-power draft which, among other things, would add a reference to hopes that "all members of the Commission will cooperate in efforts to produce constructive proposals likely to facilitate its task."

On March 21, Mr. Zorin made an unusually

moderate statement in which he said that the Soviet Union deemed it essential that the Disarmament Commission continue its work and endeavor to find common ground. His Government could not agree with the Western Powers' insistence that disclosure of information must precede reduction of armaments; in the absence of agreement to reduce armaments, countries could not be expected to disclose information on their armaments for this might result in some states claiming that they were obliged to rearm further.

Ambassador Gross expressed disappointment at the way in which his questions of March 18 had been treated. If the United States were easily discouraged, he said, the response of the Soviet delegation might lead it to believe there was no substance in the words of peace from the Kremlin. However, "we must say to the Soviet delegate: Surely this is not your last word on the subject; surely you would not have us believe the words of Premier Malenkov were empty words."

The U.S. delegate pointed to the incalculable advantages which balanced reduction of armed forces would have for the Russian people and other peoples living under Soviet rule. He was sure they yearned for a decent standard of living, and disarmament could yield this without in any way jeopardizing the security of the Soviet state.

The Soviet resolution, Ambassador Gross felt, would undo a great deal of the progress made at the last General Assembly. It proposed armaments reduction without any reference to armed forces. It sought to abandon the U.N.'s atomic energy plan. On the other hand, the United States recognized that in this resolution for the first time the Soviet Government had admitted by implication the possibility of reduction of non-atomic armaments on a basis other than a flat percentage cut. He sincerely hoped this was an indication of greater flexibility and a desire for genuine negotiation on this important problem. When the Disarmament Commission reconvened, there would be a clear test of Soviet intentions. He concluded by assuring that the United States would give the most careful and sympathetic consideration to any Soviet proposals which might lead to a genuinely safeguarded system of disarmament. (For text, see p. 503.)

In the voting, the 14-power draft as amended was approved 50-5 (Soviet bloc)-5 (Saudi Arabia, Burma, India, Indonesia, Argentina). (During the paragraph-by-paragraph voting, the Soviet bloc had cast affirmative votes on the preamble and on the portion of operative paragraph 2 requesting continuation of the Disarmament Commission's work; it had abstained on paragraph 3, requesting the Commission to report by September 1, 1953, and expressing hope for cooperation within the Commission.)

The Soviet draft resolution was rejected by a vote of 5-41-13 (Bolivia, Afghanistan, Argentina,

Egypt, Ethiopia, Burma, Iraq, Iran, Indonesia, India, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen).

On March 23 Czechoslovakia opened debate on its resolution calling upon the General Assembly to condemn the U.S. Mutual Security Act and to recommend abrogation of the section which appropriates 100 million dollars for alleged espionage and subversive activities behind the Iron Curtain. Both Vaclav David, Czechoslovak Foreign Minister, and Andrei Gromyko quoted liberally from statements of congressional and other U.S. leaders and from evidence given at spy trials in satellite countries in order to back up their contentions regarding interference by the United States aimed at overthrowing governments.

Replying to their charges, Ambassador Lodge declared that no valid indictment of the United States could be based on newspaper clippings and remarks of individual legislators since people in this country were free to speak and write as they chose. As for the question of subversion, Czechoslovakia itself was a flagrant case in point. Ambassador Lodge described the Communist subversion of the Czechoslovak state at the time of the *coup d'état* in February 1948.

With this record, Ambassador Lodge pointed out, the present rulers of Czechoslovakia, who introduced this resolution criticizing the United States, do not come into court with clean hands.

Turning to the question of escapees, Ambassador Lodge pointed out that if the Kremlin leaders are really looking for the people who are subverting life behind the Iron Curtain, they should look at themselves—at their laws, their decrees, their practices of oppression. Ambassador Lodge showed how in order to escape these practices of oppression and to seek freedom to speak, write, vote, and worship, men and women made heroic efforts to escape through the Iron Curtain despite armed guards watching from observation towers and vicious dogs patrolling the frontiers. He showed how the money expended under the Kersten amendment had been used to provide reception and living quarters, food, clothing, medical care; help in their search for visas; vocational training; and employment and emigration advice to assist in the permanent resettlement of these escapees.

Ambassador Lodge went on to show how the funds appropriated under the Kersten amendment were part of the larger sums the United States is now spending under the Mutual Security Act and has previously spent under the Marshall plan to help the free nations to stay free—to stop future Koreas and future Czechoslovakias before they start. As for U.S. intentions toward other countries, he cited U.S. technical-assistance programs and by contrast the recent Technical Assistance Conference where Soviet representatives were conspicuously absent. In conclusion he called for an emphatic rejection of the Czech resolution.

During the debate on March 25, Mr. von Balluseck said that the Czechoslovak Government and its "political friends" were really complaining that citizens of the Iron Curtain countries preferred liberty to serfdom and were leaving the "peace camp" in ever-increasing numbers for the freedom of the West. The escapees were branded as agents of the ruling circles, and those who received them and treated them as human beings were condemned by the Communist world as aggressors and subversionists. The Netherlands delegation would vote against the Czechoslovak resolution, in the belief that giving aid to destitute political refugees was no crime.

Selim Sarper (Turkey) stated that Ambassador Lodge had given convincing answers to the Soviet charges. ECA and MSA had accomplished much in Turkey, he added; there were 2,500 tractors in his country in 1948 and 35,000 in 1952, and the cereal crop had been increased by 4,500,000 tons in the same period.

There was nothing sinister about MSA aid to Free China, Chun-Ming Chang declared. Describing the constructive objectives of the U.S. program, he contrasted it with the Soviet Union's 30-year record of promoting subversive activities in foreign countries. The Chinese people were opposed to the Communist regime, the most brutal form of domination ever known in the world.

Ambassador Lodge on March 25 asked the Soviet delegation two additional questions, as to what future plans "the Kremlin's Czechoslovak puppet" has for William Oatis and what fate the Peiping regime has in store for the 100-odd Americans in Communist China. Summarizing his delegation's attitude toward the Czechoslovak attack on the Mutual Security Act, he concluded:

... the only aspect of the escapee program which merits condemnation is the fact that the world is today so organized that there are escapees. The free peoples of the world can hardly do too much for these victims of Soviet tyranny.

Our aid to escapees can only stop when escapees stop coming—when millions of men and women, now trapped behind the Iron Curtain, need no longer look elsewhere for freedom. A problem like this is not solved by tightening border controls and intensifying purges. When national aspirations are subverted, when human rights are suppressed, pressure builds up to the boiling point. One outcome of this pressure is a flow of escapees. And this flow will not stop until the Soviet leaders permit peoples under their sway to live their own lives in their own way.

So long as escapees continue to come, the duty to assist them is a matter of common humanity for the United States and the rest of the free world. It is also a duty imposed on us by the Charter. For, in essence, the United Nations Charter is a Charter of hope and freedom. It is a Charter of emancipation from religious and civil persecution, from poverty and disease, and from the even more hideous scourges of conquest and despotism.

It is a magnet drawing vast populations who see in it the expression of their hope to live their own lives in well-being and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make this magnet irresistible, strongly charging it with our support and strength.

Our Mutual Security Program will stop when the threat of aggression—not only for us, but for all the free world—is lifted. The United States, like all the free world, prefers peaceful settlements to a dangerous and burdensome armaments race. We do not enjoy that. We long for the day of honest negotiations which my Government asked for in this committee last week. We will meet the Soviet Union half-way at any time.

#### Economic and Social Council

*Commission on the Status of Women*—The Commission on March 19 approved 12-0-5 (U.S.) a French-Lebanese-Pakistani text requesting inclusion of article 1 of the Human Rights Declaration in the Civil and Political Rights Covenant.

At the following day's meeting, a compromise resolution on the nationality of married women, formulated by the resolutions committee, was approved by a vote of 12-3 (Soviet bloc)-2 (China, U.K.). The resolution recommends that the Economic and Social Council request the Secretary General to circulate to members the draft convention on nationality of married persons proposed by Cuba, with the request that members send in their comments by January 1954, in time for consideration at the Commission's eighth session.

During the same meeting, unanimous approval was given to a resolution on the status of women in private law, recommending that the Economic and Social Council call on governments to take all possible measures to insure equality of rights and duties of husband and wife in family matters, and to the wife full legal capacity and the right to engage in work outside the home and the right to acquire, administer, enjoy, and dispose of property on equal terms with her husband.

Discussion of political rights opened on March 23. Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn (U.S.) urged that attention now be focused on methods of helping governments to provide equal suffrage. As women lacked the vote in more than 15 nations, almost all of which are U.N. members, she believed that helpful recommendations could be made.

On March 24 the Commission adopted a resolution urging signature of the Convention on Political Rights. The vote was 10-0-7 (U.S., U.K., Soviet bloc, Chile). Action on the political rights item was completed on March 25, with the nearly unanimous adoption of three resolutions on submission of information drawn from annual reports on trust territories, on suggestions for future reports by the Secretary General, and on development of the political rights of women in trust and non-self-governing territories.

Debate then opened on educational opportunities for women. Describing the situation in the United States, Mrs. Hahn reported that equal educational opportunities for women were guaranteed in all States. There was practically no job for which a qualified woman could not obtain appropriate educational training. (See p. 512.)

## Communiques Regarding Korea to the Security Council

The Headquarters of the U.N. Command has transmitted communique regarding Korea to the Secretary General of the United Nations under the following U.N. document numbers: S/2904, Jan. 14; S/2921, Feb. 2; S/2923, Feb. 4; S/2924, Feb. 3; S/2925, Feb. 9; S/2926, Feb. 10; S/2931, Feb. 13; S/2932, Jan. 28; S/2933, Feb. 18; S/2935, Feb. 24; S/2937, Feb. 25; S/2938, Feb. 25; S/2940, Feb. 26; S/2941, Feb. 27; S/2943, Mar. 2; S/2944, Mar. 4.

## U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

### Commission on the Status of Women (ECOSOC)

The Department of State announced on March 16 (press release 137) that Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, U.S. representative on the Commission on the Status of Women of the U.N. Economic and Social Council (Ecosoc), will attend the seventh session of the Commission, which opened at New York on March 16. Mrs. Hahn will be assisted by the following advisers:

Mrs. Alice Angus Morrison, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor  
Mrs. Rachel C. Nason, Office of U.N. Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State  
Mrs. Harriet G. Filler, Division of Research for U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, Department of State

The agenda for this session provides for the consideration of reports concerning (1) the status of women in the family, including the property rights of married women; (2) equal suffrage for women, with special attention being given to the action which has been taken to bring into force the Convention on the Political Rights of Women which was adopted by the General Assembly last December; (3) civil rights of women, including access to Government service; (4) economic opportunities; (5) equal pay for equal work for men and women workers; (6) educational opportunities; (7) the extent to which women are serving in delegations of their governments to the United Nations and the specialized agencies; and (8) progress on the convention on the nationality of married women. A report on the work of the Commission will be prepared for submission to Ecosoc.

The Commission on the Status of Women, which was established in 1946, is one of the permanent functional commissions of Ecosoc. It is responsible for the preparation of recommendations and reports to the Council on the promotion of women's rights in political, economic, social, educational, and civil fields. Eighteen Governments, elected by the Council, comprise the membership of the Commission. Its last (sixth) session was held at Geneva, March 24-April 5, 1952.

### Technical Assistance Committee (ECOSOC)

The Department of State announced on March 20 (press release 147) that Isador Lubin, the U.S. representative on the Technical Assistance Committee of the U.N. Economic and Social Council (Ecosoc), will attend the meeting of the Committee which is scheduled to open at New York on March 23.

The following advisers will assist the U.S. representative: Philip M. Burnett, acting officer in charge of the technical assistance unit, Office of U.N. Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State; Eleanor Dennison, adviser on multilateral affairs, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State; and Johanna von Goeckingk, Division of International Administration, Department of State.

The responsibility for review of the programs and the administrative problems of the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance is carried primarily by two bodies. The Technical Assistance Board, composed of the heads of the participating organizations, undertakes the detailed review, coordination, and integration of the programs or projects submitted by the various agencies and makes reports and recommendations thereon to the Technical Assistance Committee. The Technical Assistance Committee, on which the 18-member governments of the Ecosoc are represented, reviews the reports and recommendations made by the Board; reviews the administrative problems common to all organizations participating in the operation of the program; gives general policy guidance; evaluates the effectiveness of the total program; and makes recommendations to the Ecosoc.

The last meeting of the Technical Assistance Committee was held at New York in July 1952.

### Work Plantation Committee (ILO)

The Department of State announced on March 16 (press release 138) that on that date the Committee on Work on Plantations of the International Labor Organization would begin its second session at Habana, Cuba. The U.S. delegation is as follows:

#### REPRESENTING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

##### Delegates

Clara M. Beyer, Associate Director, Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Fernando Sierra Berdecia, Secretary of Labor of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico

##### Adviser

Irving Lippe, Labor Attaché, U.S. Embassy, Habana, Cuba

#### REPRESENTING THE EMPLOYERS OF THE UNITED STATES:

##### Delegates

W. B. Hellis, General Manager, Irvine Company, Tustin, Calif.

Franklin J. Farrington, Assistant Director, Plantations Division, U. S. Rubber Company, New York, N. Y.

*Adviser*

Ross Armsby, Secretary, Manufacturing Commission, Rubber Manufacturers Association, New York, N. Y.

This committee, which held its first session at Bandung, Indonesia, December 4-16, 1950, was established by the Governing Body of the International Labor Office to examine problems common to plantation workers in all areas of the world and to devise methods for dealing with those problems within the framework of the International Labor Organization. In November 1951 the Governing Body decided that the agenda for the second session should include (1) a general report covering actions taken on the basis of the conclusions of the first session and recent events and developments affecting work on plantations; (2) definition of the term "plantations"; (3) regulation of wages on plantations; and (4) health and social services on plantations.

The Committee is composed of representatives from 18 countries: Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Cuba, Dominican Republic, France, India, Indonesia, Liberia, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Thailand, United Kingdom, the United States, and Vietnam.

#### **World Symposium on Sferics (WMO)**

The Department of State announced on March 17 (press release 141) that a World Symposium on Sferics would convene on that date at Zurich under the auspices of a Working Group on Radio-Electric Meteorology of the Commission for Aerology of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). The U.S. Government will be represented at the Symposium by observers.

Arthur W. Johnson, Meteorological Attaché American Legation, Bern, will be principal observer. Clayton H. Jensen, Major, U.S.A.F., Chief, Evaluation and Development Division, Directorate of Scientific Services, Air Weather Service, Department of the Air Force, and Lawrence A. Pick, Chief, Meteorological Branch, Sferics Section, Evans Signal Corps Laboratory, Department of the Army, also will be observers.

The purpose of the Symposium is to bring together comprehensive information on sferics (radio-electric storm detection), particularly with respect to the latest techniques in observing, recording, and transmitting data; new developments in equipment; and lists of existing sferics networks.

Worldwide inquiries on the subject have been initiated because of the value of sferics in synoptic meteorology, especially in areas with widely scattered stations and over the ocean. Sferics is a new field of weather research which has practical significance in relation to many human activities, including the protection of lives and property from severe storms and the navigation of aircraft and surface vessels.

## **THE DEPARTMENT**

### **Termination of VOA Contracts**

Press release 152 dated March 20

Contracts for construction at the Voice of America's two high-powered radio stations, Baker East near Wilmington, N.C., and Baker West at Port Angeles, Wash., were terminated on March 20 by Robert L. Johnson, Administrator of the International Information Administration.

The construction contracts for these two transmitting plants were suspended on February 17 by Mr. Johnson's predecessor and substantial maintenance costs were still being incurred.

Since taking office on March 3, Mr. Johnson has met with members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, members of the Radio Advisory Committee, and obtained technical advice from experts in and outside the Government.

As a result of this series of studies, Mr. Johnson said he has not attempted to make a final decision as to whether or not these stations should be constructed at some future date but he has concluded that it would not be justifiable to proceed under present contracts for construction at Baker East or Baker West and that these contracts should not be continued in suspension.

### **Department's Security Processes**

*Press Conference Statement by Secretary Dulles*

Press releases 149, 151, dated March 20

I thought it might be useful if I first made a little educational statement (at least I hope it will be educational), about the FBI reports and the way that they are handled.

We are trying here to get FBI checkups as rapidly as we can on all of the key people and important officials in the different departments of the Government. That includes, of course, the State Department. In the beginning we can only cover the top people, because there are so many people in this Department and in the other Departments that if we tried to do everything at one time the FBI facilities would be completely swamped.

The ordinary FBI field checkup takes from 4 to 5 weeks, depending on how diverse have been the activities of the subject of the investigation. If he's lived all his life in one spot it's fairly easy; if he's been in different parts of the country and in different businesses it takes much longer.

When the FBI field report comes in, it's a mass of interviews with persons of all sorts and varieties and of undetermined reliability. The investigators' job is to find information that is adverse, if there is any, because their business is to try to detect anything which is suspicious. Then,

when the field reports are concluded, the FBI makes summaries and these summaries deal primarily with the derogatory material because what we are looking for is danger signals. It summarizes that derogatory material but does not attempt to evaluate it. FBI reports are summaries. For example, they never say that on the basis of our investigation we conclude that "Mr. X" is or is not a good security or a good loyalty risk. That job of evaluating the report is left to the responsible officers of the Departments concerned.

Now, here in the Department of State these FBI summaries in the case of important persons are often sent to me directly and personally by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I then ask our security officer, now Mr. McLeod, to handle the matter himself or to speak to me about it. Either I, or one of the Under Secretaries acting for me, have the responsibility of making the final evaluation as far as the State Department is concerned.

Then, in the case of Presidential nominations, we report to the President and he sends the nomination to the Senate. Sometimes where the nomination is deemed to be urgent, the Department and the President act in the first instance, on the basis of quick FBI checks which are designed merely to show whether there is already in the files of the FBI any derogatory material. In that case the matter is supplemented by subsequent field investigations.

Sometimes the Foreign Relations Committee, as is its right, wants to question the Secretary of State with reference to evaluations that are put on FBI reports. It is not, however, customary to make generally available the FBI reports themselves or the summaries because this would disclose and dry up for the future sources of information of great value to the Government. The President and the Attorney General, under whom the FBI operates, closely restrict access to these records. It is, however, permissible for the Secretary of State to tell the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session about the contents of reports without actually disclosing names and sources.

In recent cases the Foreign Relations Committee has accepted the round evaluations given them by the Secretary of State. He cannot, of course, guarantee that there is no possible loyalty or security risk; the most that he can do is to say that the records of the FBI disclose no evidence of such a risk.

Where there are anonymous or unsubstantiated allegations, the Department would normally ask the FBI to continue to seek the facts and to intensify its investigation. We are doing all that is humanly possible to eliminate loyalty and security risks and in this respect we are getting splendid cooperation from the Foreign Relations Committee and from the FBI.

*In reply to a question concerning Charles E. Bohlen, whom the President nominated on Febru-*

*ary 27 to be Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Secretary Dulles said further:*

I did not find in the FBI reports in summary, any facts indicating that Mr. Bohlen might be a security or a loyalty risk. Now, it's been said that this Bohlen case is an acid test. I think it's an acid test of the orderly processes of our Government. There was a thorough investigation, the reports were brought before the Foreign Relations Committee, they were discussed there with me for a period of nearly 3 hours, and then, as I say, the Committee voted unanimously to report the nomination out to the floor of the Senate. If matters can't be dealt with and disposed of in that orderly way, it will very much disorganize the conduct of public affairs and foreign affairs at a very critical moment in history.

### **Confirmations**

#### *Livingston T. Merchant*

The Senate on March 11 confirmed Livingston T. Merchant as Assistant Secretary for European Affairs.

#### *Robert D. Murphy*

The Senate on March 20 confirmed Robert D. Murphy as Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs.

#### *Walter S. Robertson*

The Senate on March 27 confirmed Walter S. Robertson as Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.

#### *Douglas MacArthur, 2d*

The Senate on March 11 confirmed Douglas MacArthur, 2d, as Counselor of the Department.

## **THE FOREIGN SERVICE**

### **Confirmations**

The Senate on March 27 confirmed Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.

### **Check List of Department of State**

#### **Press Releases: Mar. 23-28, 1953**

Releases may be obtained from the Office of the Special Assistant for Press Relations, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press releases issued prior to Mar. 23 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 137 of Mar. 16, 138 of Mar. 16, 140 of Mar. 17, 141 of Mar. 17, 145 of Mar. 19, 147 of Mar. 20, 149 of Mar. 20, 151 of Mar. 20, and 152 of Mar. 20.

No.	Date	Subject
154	3/23	Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Commission
155	3/25	Nixon-Dulles: French Ministers
†156	3/24	Soviet reply to U.S. on plane attack
*157	3/25	Exchange of persons
*158	3/26	Cabot to visit Middle America
159	3/28	Dulles: Exchange of wounded Pow's
160	3/28	U.S.-French communiqué

\*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

<b>Africa</b>	
EGYPT: Expansion of Point Four program . . . . .	498
SUDAN: U.S. represented on Commission for Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Elections . . . . .	493
<b>Arms and Armed Forces</b>	
Formal diplomatic claims preferred against Hungary and U.S.S.R. for their conduct in 1951 plane case (Summary of U.S. notes of March 17) . . . . .	496
<b>Asia</b>	
<b>KOREA:</b>	
Communiques regarding Korea to the Security Council . . . . .	517
Exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war . . . . .	494
<b>TURKEY:</b> MSA defense support funds . . . . .	499
<b>Canada</b>	
Prime Minister to visit Washington . . . . .	500
<b>Congress</b>	
Senate resolution on minorities transmitted to U.N. (Lodge) . . . . .	506
<b>Disarmament Commission</b>	
The Soviet attitude toward the disarmament problem (Gross) . . . . .	503
<b>Europe</b>	
Formal diplomatic claims preferred against Hungary and U.S.S.R. for their conduct in 1951 plane case (Summary of U.S. notes of March 17) . . . . .	496
<b>FRANCE:</b>	
Guaranty issued for private investment . . . . .	500
U.S. and France discuss measures to promote peace (text of communique) . . . . .	491
<b>U.K.:</b> President expresses sympathy on death of Queen Mary . . . . .	493
<b>U.S.S.R.:</b> The Soviet attitude toward the disarmament problem (Gross) . . . . .	503
<b>Finance</b>	
Guaranty issued for private investment in France . . . . .	500
<b>Foreign Service</b>	
Confirmations (Bohlen) . . . . .	519
<b>Human Rights</b>	
International aspects of the status of women (Hahn) . . . . .	507
Senate resolution on minorities transmitted to U.N. (Lodge) . . . . .	506
<b>International Information</b>	
Termination of VOA contracts . . . . .	518
<b>International Meetings</b>	
Calendar of meetings . . . . .	501
<b>U.S. DELEGATIONS:</b>	
Commission on the Status of Women (ECOSOC) . . . . .	517
Technical Assistance Committee (Ecosoc) . . . . .	517
Work Plantation Committee (ILO) . . . . .	517
World Symposium on Sferics . . . . .	518
<b>Mutual Security</b>	
Guaranty issued for private investment in France . . . . .	500
MSA defense support funds for Turkey . . . . .	499
<b>Presidential Documents</b>	
President expresses sympathy on death of Queen Mary . . . . .	493
<b>Prisoners of War</b>	
Exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war . . . . .	494
<b>Protection of U.S. Nationals and Property</b>	
Formal diplomatic claims preferred against Hungary and U.S.S.R. for their conduct in 1951 plane case (Summary of U.S. notes of March 17) . . . . .	496
<b>State, Department of</b>	
Confirmations (Merchant, Murphy, Robertson, MacArthur) . . . . .	519
Department's security processes (Dulles) . . . . .	518
Termination of VOA contracts . . . . .	518
<b>Technical Cooperation and Development</b>	
Expansion of Point Four program in Egypt . . . . .	498
<b>Trade</b>	
Mr. Douglas heads trade survey . . . . .	498
<b>Treaty Information</b>	
U.S. represented on Commission for Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Elections . . . . .	493
<b>United Nations</b>	
Commission on the Status of Women (ECOSOC) . . . . .	517
Communiques regarding Korea to the Security Council . . . . .	517
Exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war . . . . .	494
International aspects of the status of women (Hahn) . . . . .	507
Senate resolution on minorities transmitted to U.N. (Lodge) . . . . .	506
Soviet attitude toward the disarmament problem (Gross) . . . . .	503
Technical Assistance Committee (Ecosoc) . . . . .	517
The United States in the United Nations . . . . .	514
<b>Name Index</b>	
Beyer, Clara M . . . . .	517
Bohlen, Charles E . . . . .	518, 519
Clark, Mark . . . . .	494
Douglas, Lewis W . . . . .	498
Dulles, Secretary . . . . .	492, 494, 518
Eisenhower, President . . . . .	493
Farrington, F. J . . . . .	518
Glidden, Harold W . . . . .	493
Gross, Ernest A . . . . .	503
Hahn, Mrs. Lorena B . . . . .	507, 517
Heillis, W. B . . . . .	517
Johnson, Arthur W . . . . .	518
Johnson, Robert L . . . . .	518
Kim Il Sung . . . . .	494
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr . . . . .	506
Lubin, Isador . . . . .	517
MacArthur, Douglas, II . . . . .	519
Mary, Queen . . . . .	493
Mayer, Prime Minister René . . . . .	492
Merchant, Livingston T . . . . .	519
Murphy, Robert D . . . . .	519
Nixon, Vice President . . . . .	492
Perkins, Warwick . . . . .	493
Robertson, Walter S . . . . .	519
Sierra Berdecia, Fernando . . . . .	517
St. Laurent, Louis S . . . . .	500
White, Lincoln . . . . .	494